THE EMPIRE CLUB

ADDRESSES 1954-1955

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/empireclubofcana1954unse

JAMES H. JOYCE
President of The Empire Club of Canada
1954-1955

THE EMPIRE CLUB
OF CANADA

Addresses 1954-1955

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN

TORONTO: T. H. BEST PRINTING CO. LTD.

Copyright, Canada, 1955
The Empire Club of Canada

Fifty-second year of Issue

YEAR BOOK PUBLISHING COMMITTEE
1954 - 1955

David G. C. Menzel (Chairman)
Ernest Miles
Z. S. Phimister

PRINTED AND BOUND IN CANADA
T. H. Best Printing Co., Limited, Toronto

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1954 - 1955

Honorary President: FIELD MARSHAL THE RIGHT HONOURABLE EARL ALEXANDER OF TUNIS

Officers:

President: JAMES H. JOYCE
First Vice-President: LT. COL. N. D. HOGG, M.B.E., E.D.
Second Vice-President: DR. C. C. GOLDRING
Third Vice-President: DONALD H. JUPP, O.B.E.
Secretary: ERNEST MILES
Hon. Treasurer: W. W. COMBER, C.A.
Honorary Secretary: R. FORD RALPH
Assistant Secretary: DR. CLARENCE B. CRUMMEY
Hon. Auditor: H. T. JAMIESON, F.C.A.

Executive Committee:

ROSS ANDERSON
H. C. BOURLIER
RUSSELL W. BUYERS
F. JOSEPH CORNISH
S. S. FLETCHER
MARVIN GELBER
WARREN B. HASTINGS
H. R. JACKMAN
J. PALMER KENT, Q.C.
H. R. LAWSON
BRUCE J. LEGGE
DAVID G. C. MENZEL
HAROLD MENZIES
LT. COL. W. H. MONTAGUE, O.B.E., E.D.
Z. S. PHIMISTER
DAVID J. ROCHE
A. G. SCULTHORPE
ALEXANDER STARK

Immediate Past President:

ARTHUR E. M. INWOOD

Past Presidents:

SYDNEY HERMANT
D. H. GIBSON, C.B.E.
JOHN WILLIAM GRIFFIN

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

PAST HONOURARY PRESIDENTS:

*1903-1912	Rt. Hon. Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, G.C.M.G., LL.D., D.C.L.
*1913-1926	Field Marshal H.R.H. The Duke of Connaught and Strathearn, K.G., G.C.M.G.
*1927-1931	Rt. Hon. Viscount Willingdon, G.C.S.I., G.C.M.G.
1931-1935	Rt. Hon. The Earl of Bessborough, P.G., G.C.M.G.
*1935-1940	Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedsmuir, G.C.M.G., C.H.
1940-46	Rt. Hon. The Earl of Athlone, K.C., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., D.S.O., V.D.

PAST PRESIDENTS:

*1902-05	Brig.-Gen. James Mason
*1905-06	Rev. William Clark, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L.
*1906-07	J. P. Murray, Esq.
*1907-08	J. F. M. Stewart, Esq., B.A.
*1908-09	D. J. Goggin, Esq., M.A., D.C.L.
*1909-10	Elias Clouse, Esq., M.D., C.M., L.F.P.S. Glasgow, L.R.C.P.S. Edin.
*1910-11	J. Castell Hopkins, Esq., F.R.S.
*1911-12	F. B. Fetherstonhaugh, Esq., K.C.
*1912-13	Rt. Rev. James F. Sweeney, M.A., D.D., D.C.L.
*1913-14	Mr. Justice James Craig
*1914-15	Lt.-Col. R. J. Stuart
*1915-16	Albert Ham, Esq., Mus. Doc.
*1916-17	James Black Perry, Esq.
*1917-18	Norman Sommerville, Esq., M.A., K.C.
1918	F. J. Coombs, Esq.
1919	R. A. Stapells, Esq.
*1920	Arthur Hewitt, Esq.
*1921	Brig. Gen. C. H. Mitchell, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., LL.D.
*1922	Sir William Hearst, K.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.
1923	Ellis H. Wilkinson, Esq.
*1924	William Brooks, Esq.
*1925	Rev. R. N. Burns, D.D.
1926	Col. A. E. Kirkpatrick, Hon. A.D.C., V.D.
*1927	Col. Alexander Fraser, LL.D., A.D.C.
*1928	Robert H. Fennell, Esq., K.C.
*1929	Hugh S. Eayrs, Esq.
*1930	John D. Spence, Esq., B.A., K.C.
1931	H. G. Stapells, Esq., Q.C.
1932-33	Col. The Hon. Geo. A. Drew, V.D., A.D.C.
1933-34	Major James Baxter, M.C.
1934-35	Hon. Dana H. Porter, Q.C.

* Deceased.

*1935-36	J. H. Brace, Esq.
*1936-37	Major G. B. Balfour, B.A., K.C.
1937-38	Major R. M. Harcourt
1938-39	J. P. Pratt, Esq., Q.C.
*1939-40	F. A. Gaby, Esq., B.A.Sc., D.Sc.
*1940-41	The Hon. G. Howard Ferguson, P.C. (Can.), K.C.
1941-42	C. R. Sanderson, Esq., M.A., B.Sc.
*1942-43	John C. MacBeth, Esq., B.A., Q.C.
1943-44	W. Eason Humphreys, Esq.
1944-45	Charles R. Conquergood, Esq.
1945-46	Eric F. Thompson, Esq.
1946-47	Major F. L. Clouse
1947-48	Tracy E. Lloyd, Esq.
1948-49	Thos. H. Howse, Esq.
1949-50	H. G. Colebrook, Esq.
1950-51	Sydney Hermant, Esq.
1951-52	D. H. Gibson, Esq., C.B.E.
1952-53	John Griffin, Esq.
1953-54	Arthur E. M. Inwood, Esq.
1954-55	James H. Joyce, Esq.

*Deceased.

EXCERPT FROM "ORIGIN AND OBJECTS OF THE EMPIRE CLUB" PUBLISHED IN THE YEAR BOOK FOR 1903-1904

On November 18th, 1903, a small meeting was held in Webb's Restaurant, Toronto, mainly on the initiative of Lieut.-Col. James Mason, for the purpose of preliminary discussion. The Chairman in a brief speech pointed to the desirability of an organization, following the plan of weekly luncheons, to be addressed by prominent men, or men speaking with authority upon the issues of the day, and having also a distinctive basis of British Unity in its work and policy.

A sub-Committee met on the following day and appointed . . . . . a Committee to draft a Constitution.

The meeting at which these principles and rules were approved and organization effected was held at the Luncheon hour on November 25th, in Webb's Restaurant, with some seventy gentlemen present . . . . after a discussion of various proposed names . . . . The Empire Club of Canada . . . . was approved by a large majority.

THE ROYAL EMPIRE SOCIETY

AND

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

The Royal Empire Society of London, England, and The Empire Club of Canada at Toronto were both founded for a single purpose and with a common aim:—The strengthening of the bonds of unity within the Empire. This mutual objective is prosecuted with vigorous enthusiasm by the members of these organizations on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean.

The opinions and views expressed in the Addresses contained in this volume are those of the speakers themselves and do not necessarily carry the full or partial endorsement of The Empire Club of Canada.

CONTENTS

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 1954-1955 - v

PAST PRESIDENTS - - - - - - - - vii

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS - - - - - - xiv

PETER THORNEYCROFT, M.P.
"Combined Operations" - - - - - 1

REV. CANON V. J. PIKE, C.B., C.B.E., M.A.
"Opening Meeting, Season 1954-55" - - - 6

THE RIGHT HON. THE VISCOUNT SWINTON, P.C.
"The Commonwealth and Britain's Economic Recovery" - - - - - - - 16

THE HON. GEORGE A. DREW, P.C.
"Britain Goes Over the Top" - - - - - 27

THE LORD BAILLIEU, K.B.E., C.M.G.
"Challenge of Our Time" - - - - 40

DONALD GORDON, ESQ.
"Railway Highlights" - - - - - 56

GORDON R. MCGREGOR, ESQ.
"The Farnborough Show" - - - - - - 70

ARTHUR MALONEY, ESQ., Q.C. AND
JOSEPH SEDGWICK, ESQ., Q.C.
"The Death Penalty—For and Against" - - 76

THE EARL OF WEMYSS AND MARCH
"The Scottish Scene" - - - - - - - 93

HON. ALASTAIR BUCHAN
"The United States and Co-Existence" - - 107

CHRISTMAS MEETING
With Dr. Leslie Bell and The Leslie Bell Singers 122

ROY HERBERT THOMPSON
"Scottish Home Rule" - - - - - - 124

J. A. MACFARLANE
"The Modern Medical School—Its Aims and Obligations" - - - - - - - - 139

J. B. MCGEACHY
"Our Parliament, its Organization and Work" - 151

HORACE KING, M.P.
"The British Answer to Communism" - - - 161

THE HON. LIONEL CHEVRIER
"The St. Lawrence Seaway" - - - - - 172

MRS. OGDEN REID
An Address - - - - - - - - 182

DR. ALEXANDER FLECK
"The Changing Commonwealth - - - - 191

THE HON. PAUL MARTIN
"Canada—A World Partner" - - - - 205

DR. C. C. GOLDRING
"Men, Music and Schools" - - - - - 213

HERBERT H. LANK
"Education and Industry" - - - - - 217

OAKAH L. JONES
"Natural Gas Comes to Toronto" - - - 226

DOUGLAS WHITE AMBRIDGE
"Fears and Fancies of the Forests" - - - 233

RALPH JARRON CORDINER
"New Challenges of North America's 'Fastest' Decade" - - - - - - - - 243

DAVID ARNOLD KEYS
"The Peacetime Applications of Atomic Energy" 255

HON. KOTO MATSUDAIRA
"Japan's Position in the Far East" - - - 269

JAMES A. FARLEY
"Our Common Mission" - - - - - 283

ANNUAL MEETING - - - - - - - - - 291

WALTER TAPLIN, ESQ.
"Commonwealth Trade and Beyond" - - - 295

THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT - - - - 306

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 1955-1956 - 309

CONSTITUTION - - - - - - - - - 310

MEMBERSHIP - - - - - - - - 315

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

THE PRESIDENT, 1954-1955 - - - - *Frontispiece*

BETWEEN PAGES
64-65

OCTOBER 7TH, 1954
  Rev. Canon V. J. Pike Meeting
  The President, James H. Joyce and Immediate Past President, A. E. Inwood.

NOVEMBER 4TH, 1954
  Donald Gordon Meeting

NOVEMBER 18TH, 1954
  Gordon R. McGregor Meeting

JANUARY 20TH, 1955
  J. B. McGeachy Meeting

FEBRUARY 10TH, 1955
  Mrs. Ogden Reid Meeting

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

"COMBINED OPERATIONS"

An Address by

PETER THORNEYCROFT, M.P.
President of the Board of Trade, London, England

Joint Meeting with The Canadian Club of Toronto and the Board of Trade, Toronto.

Friday, June 11th, 1954

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. THORNEYCROFT: I thank you for this opportunity of addressing a few words to such an important and representative audience.

Since I spoke at the opening of the International Trade Fair at Toronto twelve days ago I have travelled far and seen much of Canadian enterprise and effort. I have been deeply impressed both with the extent of your resources and with the energy with which you exploit them. While in Vancouver I had an opportunity of saying a few words about the value of mutual trade between us. The more dollars we earn in trade with Canada the quicker we can rid ourselves of the unnatural restrictions we have been forced to impose on dollar trade. Three days ago at Jasper I met the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and discussed with them some of the technical advances of United Kingdom industry and how best they could be linked with the vast achievements of Canadian enterprise.

Today I want for a few moments to look outside this field of Canadian-United Kingdom trade, and see how jointly we should face the world beyond. Certain it is that we must face it together. I think we *are* doing so. The United Kingdom and Canada have learnt to co-operate with mutual profit in exciting developments right across this country. One of the best examples is in this

City in the form of the Toronto Subway. You will remember what Mr. Duncan said at the opening of that Subway.

> ". . . Those beautiful cars in which you have travelled were built in the ancient city of Gloucester in the shadow of the Cotswold hills. The rails on which they run were made in Canada and in the United States. Those gleaming glass surfaces which you have admired in the stations were rolled in Yorkshire and put together in Ontario. The signal system came from London. The steel which lies embedded in the structure was the product of the United States and Great Britain, of Belgium, of Germany and of Luxembourg. Truly an international project."

That speech epitomizes what I want to say today on how Canada and the United Kingdom can co-operate in meeting the problem of the world outside and how such co-operation can be of benefit to both of us. As man has learned to move faster and faster, and increased his power over matter and over space, so the world has shrunk. Lands once beyond our horizon are now reached in a few hours by luxury air liners, or for that matter by heavy bombers. In this new small world of ours, it is no longer possible to shut out the forces and misfortunes of our neighbours. Walls no longer count for very much. The Great Wall of China and the Maginot Line are equally archaic, and I may say equally irrelevant to a city which can shrink to the size of a bomb crater. The barriers which tower above us are not walls but curtains and they stand not against aggression and violence, but against co-operation, friendship and understanding.

Paradoxically, the existence of these barriers has stimulated co-operation and understanding in the free world. They have led among other things to the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, one of the most remarkable examples of international co-operation which the world has seen. Let it not be forgotten that the organisation owes much to the vision and the initiative of Canadian statesmen, and not least Mr. St. Laurent. Through NATO Canada has contributed a Western European Defence Force stationed beside our own in Germany. In addition Canada has provided mutual aid to the tune of $300 million a year including substantial expenditure on the air training scheme. That training scheme itself is probably an outstanding example of international co-operation in the field of defence. The pilots, I may say, gain more than skill in the management of modern air craft, they gain a knowledge of Canada and friendship both with Canadians and trainees of many nationalities.

I have spoken first of co-operation for defence, for defence is also basic to our needs and our emergencies, but our co-operation goes, of course, much further and it needs to do so. The struggle for men's minds is not an unimportant part of what is going on in the world. If we are to win in that struggle we must have a joint and demonstrable success in the economic and commercial policies we pursue. Prosperity like peace is indivisible.

It is these thoughts which have dominated the commercial policy of our two countries and also, may I add, have dominated the policy of the United States of America. We have felt the need of combined operations, not only against the threat of aggression, but against the wants, the poverty, the hunger of the world. There is today a greater awareness of the needs of populations in other parts of the world than perhaps at any other time in our history. It is this realisation which has made possible the bold conception of the Colombo Plan. South and South-East Asia are a long way from Toronto, but what happens there can have a great impact upon what happens here, and not only alas in the field of commerce. South Asia contains a half of the world population. It contains too much poverty and hunger. It is estimated that by 1970 its numbers will have increased by ten times the total population of Canada. Developments there, apart from common humanity, must have an immense impact upon economies elsewhere. It is in places such as this that markets are fashioned and the size and scope of world demand are finally decided.

What is needed is capital, equipment and skill, and it is a measure of the size of Canadian statesmanship that Canada should have contributed these things so generously in the development of Asia. Certain it is that Canada's great gift of wheat saved millions from hunger, and that Canadian funds have played large part in a number of great capital developments in India and in Pakistan.

I have mentioned only two of the bodies, NATO and the Colombo Plan through which you and we are co-operating in the international field. There are, of course, many more and I do not intend to work my way through the list of them today. I have perhaps said enough to illustrate that we are both engaged in practical co-operative efforts in places far from our own shores. But if it is important that we co-operate with other countries it is above all important that we should co-operate with one another. Few countries have more to gain than Canada and the United Kingdom from the mutual exchange of goods, of ideas and human beings. That is why I attach particular importance to the trainees and the scholarship schemes, which exist between the United Kingdom and Canada, and I mention in particular the Athlone Fellowship. There can be no finer way of pooling both our ideas and resources.

With the job you have to do at home, and it is certainly a large one, you might have been excused in concentrating upon it rather than looking at the world outside. Probably in history few nations have developed at such a pace as Canada, and at the same time had the vision and vitality to take part and often inspire the great schemes of international co-operation that are being fashioned at the present time. We are proud to be associated with you in these combined efforts to secure the peace efforts we make in the domestic field, whether in Ottawa and prosperity of the world. They are tasks which none of us could tackle single-handed. If we neglect them the or London, can only have a limited effect. The real pathway to success in international trade lies in the direction of building up world trade as a whole. What happens outside our frontiers is at least as important as what happens within them. In Canada and in the United Kingdom we have recognised this basic truth, and we are not hesitating to devote our energies jointly towards finding a solution.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. James H. Joyce, President of The Empire Club of Canada.

"OPENING MEETING, SEASON 1954-55"

An Address by

REV. CANON V. J. PIKE, C.B., C.B.E., M.A.
Chaplain to the Queen

Thursday, October 7th, 1954

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: Before going on the air I think I have time to complete a very pleasant ceremony.

Those of you who were present last November at our Club's 50th Anniversary Luncheon will remember that we presented to our distinguished Past Presidents a certificate acknowledging with grateful thanks their services to our Club.

Since that meeting we have added another Past President to our list—Mr. Arthur E. M. Inwood, last year's President. The very successful year which this Club had last year was due in no small measure to his untiring effort and hard work.

Thus it is most fitting that we should, at this first meeting of our new season, present Mr. Inwood with an acknowledgment of our thanks for his services.

This certificate reads:

> The Empire Club of Canada acknowledges with grateful thanks the services of Arthur E. M. Inwood as President during the year 1953-54

and is signed under seal by our Honorary President, Lord Alexander of Tunis, your President, and Mr. Ernest Miles, our faithful, hard-working Secretary. Incidentally, I might add that Mr. Miles took this certificate to England and had it signed in his presence by Lord Alexander.

Mr. Inwood, it gives me great pleasure to present this certificate to you.

* * *

Our speaker today is Major General, the Reverend Canon Joseph Pike, C.B., C.B.E., M.A., Chaplain to the Queen, and Chaplain-General to the Forces of Britain—a man who has a most distinguished war record.

Born 47 years ago in Ireland, Canon Pike was educated at Bishop Foy School, Waterford, and Trinity College, Dublin.

He started his career as a Curate in Dundrum County and in Dublin from 1930 to 1932 and was appointed Chaplain to the Forces, 4th Class, in July 1932.

In his younger days Canon Pike was a great athlete. He played international rugby for Ireland during the years 1931 to 1935 inclusive and was capped thirteen times.

Early in 1941 Canon Pike was appointed Senior Chaplain for the 43rd Division and in May 1942 Senior Chaplain to the 11th Division. From September 1942 to January 1945 he was Deputy Assistant Chaplain General to the 5th Corps, serving in the United Kingdom, North Africa and in Italy. He was awarded the C.B.E. in 1944.

For about nine months in 1945 Canon Pike was Assistant Chaplain General of the 8th Army in Italy, but in the latter part of the year was appointed Deputy Chaplain General of the Middle East Land Forces. Subsequently, in 1947, he became Assistant Chaplain General of the Western Command and in 1950 received the same appointment with the British Army of the Rhine.

Canon Pike was appointed to his present post of Chaplain General to the Forces in November, 1951 and appointed Chaplain to the Queen on November 3rd, 1953, being the youngest clergyman ever to receive that appointment . . . Major General the Reverend Canon V. J. Pike.

CANON PIKE: It is a tremendous privilege and a tremendous honour for me to be here with you today and indeed I am more than grateful to the Canadian Army who have brought me out here as their guest. I think it is the first time in history that a Chaplain-General has visited this land and I cannot tell you how greatly indebted I am and how impressed I am. It is indeed a privilege for me to be here with you as your speaker at this Luncheon.

When I was coming over the Atlantic, Colonel Forth, your Principal Protestant Chaplain, was escorting me and all the time I think he was trying to make me into a Canadian!!! When we got into the St. Lawrence he said, "Do you see those rocks? Those are the oldest rocks in the world."

"Absolute rubbish!" I said. "We have rocks in Ireland and they are so small, so worn away with time and age they are only the size of pebbles!" I had to do something to keep my end up!

But mainly today I would like to talk to you a little about the job I have to do, giving to you, who belong to this Empire Club, some picture of the commitments of the British Army within the Empire and within the Commonwealth of Nations to which we all belong.

If you can conceive Russia as a great kind of volcano that might erupt at any time or any place in its great circumference, then all around that circumference you will see the Armed Forces of the Crown of one member nation or another, standing guard. Today we stand guard in the British Army right around the whole of that circumference, from Berlin in the West down through the British Army of the Rhine in Germany, in Austria, in Trieste, Malta, Cyprus, the Middle East, up the Gulf of Aqaba, which very few people have ever heard about (there is quite a considerable British Force there); across to Hong Kong, over on the mainland of China, in Kowloon, and right round to Japan and Korea.

That is a tremendous . . . may I use the word . . . Diocese, My Lords, for me to try and cover. The Bishops here have got pretty big ones . . . I think I have got one a little bigger. Within that the British Army today is gravely committed in order to maintain law, order and peace.

Our troops are in action in different types of warfare in Korea (which is quiet at the moment), in Malaya, Kenya; and the conditions under which men work and fight in those places are far from easy. I suppose few people know, even at home, the conditions under which a British soldier fights in Malaya. He has a tough, tough enemy. He is fighting under the most abnormal conditions in the jungle, and, Gentlemen, the jungle has to be visited and seen before it can be appreciated! The soldiers go out on patrol. The patrol generally goes single-file, the leader cutting his way through the foliage, which is so thick and heavy that it falls in, and you are lucky if you see the chap in front or behind you. I think the greatest nuisance there that the soldiers have to meet with are the various types of microbes that bite them, and so on. In one way or another they have got to be frightfully careful, because we have found by experience that men were getting diseases of one sort or another; and very, very severe discipline had to be carried out in order to prevent men picking leeches off themselves, for as often as not the head remained and set up a sepsis. So if you saw a patrol at the end of the day, before coming to their final destination, they would strip stark naked, light a cigarette, and put it against the tail of the animal, and out he comes . . . rather like the monkeys at the Zoo!!

The Padre works under these conditions with the men out on patrol. It rains very heavily every evening in Malaya and literally there is no daylight in the jungle. There is a constant gloom; there is the thick foliage in which the enemy is hidden and overhead the immense forest of trees spreading out like a huge umbrella. There is no daylight—in the jungle you have only twilight.

When the patrol settles down for the night they build little huts or shelters of atap leaves (rather like a banana leaf) and in there the Padre very quietly, almost under his breath, takes some prayers and Bible reading. No hymns can be sung. A perimeter guard is put out. Talking is forbidden; smoking is forbidden. There is absolute silence so that the position will not be given away during the night. These kind of conditions are very trying.

I think that during the last two or three years General Templer has done in Malaya a most terrific job, and slowly but gradually we are getting on top of this unpleasant business.

Coming to Kenya: The position is very similar to Malaya, where there is the Malay, the Chinese and the white man. It is the same in Kenya: you have the native African, the Asian or Indian, and the white man. The conditions under which we are fighting the Mau Mau in Kenya are very similar to those in Malaya.

Perhaps there is one thing frightens the British soldier more than anything else . . . rarely a day passes that some patrol or other isn't charged by a rhinocerous. The average British soldier comes from some town and has never seen one. And to have two and a half tons of pretty tough flesh with a horn in front charging you is a rather uncomfortable experience! However, the rhinocerous charges with its eyes shut and there have been no serious accidents so far.

I would like to say something about the old Home Country on this occasion. A lot of people ask me, "How is Britain faring these days?" I want you to think back, if you will, for a moment. Fourteen years ago Britain was being attacked from the air. Our big cities were being bombed and children were evacuated by the hundreds of thousands out into the countryside. They were taken from their homes, their churches, everything that normally moulds the youth of the nation: and today we are getting those young men into the Services as National Servicemen. There was a certain amount of apprehension, I think, as to how they would turn out. I can tell you here quite faithfully and honestly, and without any holding back, that the quality of the young British manhood today coming into the Services is second to none. They have proved their worth and I believe they are an even better quality than the previous generation.

This augurs well for the future. In spite of all the drawbacks of the early days of their young lives, there is magnificent material there.

What about the men who are leading them? I would say that Britain today is short of leaders. I don't suppose you can have two great world wars without eliminating a considerable number of your youth and the young manhood who were endowed to be your future leaders. Nevertheless, in spite of that shortage—and I have been in the British Army now for 23 years—I have never known the quality of leadership at the top (and I mean the top, from Lieutenant Colonels commanding regiments to Generals) so high or so good as it is today; and I believe that under these conditions of leadership and with the material that is available for those men to lead, things are going extraordinarily well.

No, I am not here to talk politics and I am not here to beat around the bush. My job is a Parson's job, and I am going to talk about that in a very practical way. You know different people perhaps need different kinds of treatment and I find, as an Irishman, one has got to be fairly pliable when one is in this particular kind of job, because different nationalities have different ways of looking at things.

Some man summed up the four nationalities at home. He said: "The Welsh pray to God on Sundays and on their neighbours the rest of the week. The Scotsman keeps the Sabbath and all the rest he can lay his hands on. The Irishman never knows what he wants, but he will fight to the death until he gets it. The Englishman is a self-made man and he worships his maker."

Well, I don't know how one would summarize Canadians—I haven't got that far yet. Nevertheless, among us all it is interesting to look back at hisory . . . it is interesting to see how this thing, the British Commonwealth of Nations or Empire, or whatever you like to call it, has evolved, and I believe that it is one of the greatest things that exists in the world today. I believe that under God . . . and I would like to stress that . . . it is a most remarkable thing, when you think of it, that millions and millions of the people of this earth, of different colour, different racial characteristics, different creeds and religions, have all been united in one great family, and it is a fact which they appreciate. In my particular job I meet lots of people who are outside the family, and they look with almost jealous eyes at this wonderful possession that you and I have inherited. Gentlemen, we are the trustees for something that is great and true and fine, and the future is ours to make of it what we will.

Now, here in Canada I hear you using the expression "The Mother Country". If that is so . . . if you are one of the sons of the Mother Country, you have now grown into an elder brother and already one can see how Canada is taking her responsibility as an elder brother in this great family of nations.

When I was asked to come out here I started delving into Canadian history of fifty years ago and the changes that have taken place in this country in the last fifty years have been incredible. It is a remarkable thing to think that today you have troops in Korea and in Germany. You have had teams of experts advising on the Kashmir question, and at this moment advising in Indo-China. Canada has grown up into the elder brother and is taking her share in the welfare and wellbeing of this great family of nations. We are an immense size, but I think there is a danger that we may think our size is the thing that matters.

I would like now to hark back to those rocks that Colonel Forth was talking about. If what the scientists tell us is true, and you had been an individual here six or eight million years ago, you would have seen the immense forces of nature let loose. You would have seen the most tremendous earthquakes; you would have seen mountains being carved out and forced up from the earth; you would have seen great valleys split asunder; you would have seen great fires. And all around this existing earth and its formation there was a slimy sludge and in that sludge there was the tiny, tiny, invisible protoplasm or origin of life. As a betting man, which would you put your money on . . . the tiny pin point of protoplasm or the great forces of nature? The average man would bet on the latter, but the impossible has happened: From that little pin point of protoplasm have come Science and Saints, Art and Mind and Beauty and Culture, and everything else, and the point I am trying to get across, Gentlemen, is this, that virility is mightier than size. Vitality is mightier than size. And if it is true anywhere—and it is true in this immense country of yours—it is the vitality of the people, not your natural resources, that is the wealth of a nation. It is not your economic setup or your political strength that forms the wealth of a nation. The wealth of a nation is in the hearts of her people.

Now look at this Empire. Of course we are human. We have from time to time made mistakes; that is true and we admit them. But I believe that the British Empire under God has made a greater contribution to the well-being and welfare of the human race than this world has ever known. (Applause). I cannot see in the history of any other nation such a thing performed as we have given, in spite of the mistakes that we have made.

Well, there it is. But don't let us therefore lose sight of the thing that makes us great. People often ask me what made Great Britain great, and I tell them it was the impact of individual men and women, not large groups, but individual men and women who had a vision of life and they gave it. For instance, if you were in England a hundred years ago—only one hundred years ago—you would have seen boys from the age of seven down in the coal mines, and they were not modernized as they are today . . . they were filthy death-traps. You would have seen boys of seven doing a six-day week, twelve hours a day. You would have seen girls from the age of nine chained, in many cases, to the cotton looms in Lancashire and the woollen looms in Yorkshire, doing a six-day week, ten hours a day. You would have seen tramping around the countryside a dirty looking individual with a little horde of orphan boys, mostly at the age of five or six, tiny little tots, and they were used to sweep the chimneys. Almost incredible to believe, the young lad was shoved up the chimney!

Then in Britain there came forward a man named Lord Shaftesbury. I needn't tell you about the fight, the persistence, the endeavour. He had a vision that this was not the mind of God . . . this was not the mind of Christ . . . and he fought until he got the Factory Acts passed through Parliament. But what made Lord Shaftesbury? Where did he get this vision from? Well, his father, the previous Earl, was a rather hard kind of man . . . his mother, a rather cold kind of woman, and this boy, Ashley Cooper, who was born to them was rather neglected. But they had an English "nanny". She had nothing . . . no University degree . . . she had never been to college . . . she never got Matric or anything else. But she had one thing: she had understanding and friendship of a real Christian and a vision of what a Christian man might achieve. She died when Ashley Cooper was seven, but during the first seven years of his early life, she moulded and fashioned in that young lad the thing which brought him all the way through his life. And I believe, if you ask me what made Britain great, that it was the Spirit of Christ unfolded in every kind of practical way by individual men and women who gave themselves unstintingly, unselfishly and whole-heartedly. I believe about this British Empire of ours, that provided we keep those characteristics and those principles, it is unbeaten and unbeatable, and I believe the real strength of our Commonwealth depends on the quality of the lives that you and I possess, and to the extent that the Carpenter of Nazareth can unfold His principles and put forward in our daily lives His practices, that come what may, we can face any weather, any storm.

You know, I have often heard the song "Land of Hope and Glory". I love that song, because I believe it to be true. "Land of Hope and Glory, Mother of the Free" . . .

and it goes on to say: “Mightier still and mightier shall thy bounds be set; God who made thee mightier, make thee mightier yet”.

While I hope and pray that that may be true, and true in this sense . . . wider still and wider . . . not that we may gain more territory, not that we may absorb more land or continents or countries, but I pray that wider still and wider the influence of the British way of life and all we have learned, and all we stand for, may go out into this world that is rather mad, a bit bad, and is certainly sad.

That is the prayer I would pray as I sing that song, that the influence of what we know in this Empire we might share and pass on to others.

So in conclusion, Gentlemen, let us be proud of this heritage, let us guard it faithfully, with all that is good and all that is true and all that is fine and noble in our own personal lives. Let us constantly look to the source from which we draw that strength to fulfil those virtues in our lives.

It doesn’t really much matter in this world if we become popular . . . it doesn’t really much matter if we accumulate great wealth or prestige or power. The great thing is, when we have laid down our charge, whether we have been successful or not. That is the thing that counts. All the other things are subsidiary.

I love the words of an anonymous writer, and I leave them with you . . . they describe success: “He has achieved success who has lived well, laughed often and loved much, who has gained the respect of intelligent men and the love of little children, who has done his part, who has filled his niche and who has left this world a better place than he found it.”

Thank you, Mr. President . . . thank you very much, Gentlemen, for this great privilege and great honour of being your guest today.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Bishop Wilkinson.

"THE COMMONWEALTH AND BRITAIN'S ECONOMIC RECOVERY"

An Address by

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
THE VISCOUNT SWINTON, P.C.
Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations

A Joint Meeting with The Canadian Club of Toronto

Friday, October 15th, 1954

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: This is a joint meeting of our two great Clubs to hear an address by Great Britain's Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations—The Right Honourable The Viscount Swinton, P.C., G.B.E., C.H., M.C. Lord Swinton, who has been a prominent figure in British politics since 1920 is also the Deputy Leader of the House of Lords, a post he has held since 1951.

Born in Yorkshire 70 years ago, Philip Lloyd-Graeme—better known as Sir Philip Cunliffe-Lister, a name he assumed later—was educated at Winchester and at University College, Oxford. He was called to the Bar in 1908 and decided to specialize in Mining Law.

However, he joined the Army in 1914 and served in France, winning the M.C. and rising to the rank of Major. Invalided home, he was appointed Joint Secretary to the Ministry of Labour in 1917. This led to his leaving the Bar for politics, so the next year he was elected to

Parliament as Conservative Member for Hendon, a seat he held until his elevation to the Peerage in 1935.

In 1920 he was knighted and also received his first appointment at the Board of Trade as Parliamentary Secretary. A year later he became Secretary of the Department of Overseas Trade and in 1922 reached full Ministrial Rank with his appointment as President of the Board of Trade, an office he held for three periods . . . 1922-23, 1924-29 and in 1931.

As President of the Board of Trade he presided over the Imperial Economic Conference in 1923 and the International Conference of Maritime Nations in 1928, which adopted a Convention which did much to improve conditions for safety at sea. He was also responsible for legislation to reorganize the British film industry.

Sir Philip's next appointment was that of Secretary of State for the Colonies, a post he held from 1931 to 1935. He established the Economic Section at the Colonial Office and instituted an economic survey of the Colonies which was used at the Ottawa Conference in 1932.

As Colonial Secretary he displayed the air-mindedness which was to distinguish him later. He also made annual tours in the Colonies, in order to gain first-hand knowledge of their problems.

In 1935 he was raised to the Peerage, taking the title of Viscount Swinton, from his Yorkshire home. From 1935 to 1938 he was Secretary of State for Air. Alive to the dangers of the European situation he worked tirelessly for a strong Air Force and was responsible for setting up the famous "Tizard Committee" under which radar was developed. Within a short time he had trebled the numbers of the Air Force personnel. In the requirement of the Air Force he chose the difficult task of developing new types . . . among them the Spitfire and Hurricane which won the Battle of Britain. To speed up production he cut out the prototype stage, ordering "straight off the drawing-board". The power-operated turret, the cannon gun, the shadow factory scheme, the R.A.F. Volunteer Reserve, the balloon barrage and the use of wireless long-range telephony on aircraft, all had their origins in the Swinton era at the Air Ministry.

Early in the war Lord Swinton was Chairman of the United Kingdom Commercial Corporation, a body formed to buy "pre-emptively" materials which might be of use to the enemy. It also supplied goods to the civil populations in countries behind the fighting line.

In 1942 he was appointed Minister Resident in West Africa. The fall of France and the closing of the Mediterranean had made West Africa a strategic highway both by sea and by air.

He set up a War Council and a Civil Committee and with their help organized the war effort of the West African colonies.

In October 1944 Lord Swinton was recalled to Britain to become the first Minister of Civil Aviation. Some of his proposals became the basis of the 1946 Bermuda Civil Aviation Agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom.

He was also responsible for the White Paper on British Air Transport presented in March 1945 (usually known as the "Swinton Plan"), reorganizing the British Civil Air Transport services.

While still in West Africa Lord Swinton had spoken of the possibility of converting the great network of military airlines to civil use. He visited South Africa in the spring of 1945 for a series of conferences on air communications between Britain and South Africa. The plan evolved for the United Kingdom-South African air route served as a model when the Commonwealth Air Council met in June under Lord Swinton's Chairmanship, for arrangements for the other main Commonwealth routes.

Lord Swinton has visited most of the Commonwealth countries since his appointment as Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations in November 1952. He will address us on the subject of "The Commonwealth and Britain's Economic Recovery" . . . the Right Honourable The Viscount Swinton.

VISCOUNT SWINTON: Your Honour, Mr. President and Gentleman: It is quite a long catalogue of previous convictions which the President has presented. I will give you one assurance, that I know today I don't know it all, and that I have come to Canada to learn some more. The day a man thinks he knows it all he had better go.

I am so grateful to the two great Clubs for inviting me here and I am deeply grateful to the Prime Minister of Canada for inviting me to come back to Canada on this visit. I think visits of Ministers should be a two way traffic. Your Ministers . . . indeed, all the Commonwealth Ministers . . . so often gravitate to London, but it is enormously important that we in the British Government should come to you, and I think that applies particularly to whoever is the Minister for Commonwealth Relations. I am glad to say this isn't by any means my first visit. But I haven't been across Canada since 1932 and I am staggered by the progress which I find everywhere.

You referred, Sir, to my presiding over the first Imperial Economic Conference in 1923. In all the offices I have held it has been my good fortune to be very closely associated with Commonwealth affairs. In all those years the contact has never been closer or more constant than it is today; and what I think is more important, the mutual understanding and cooperation has never been greater. In the world today, with all its difficulties and uncertainties, we of the Commonwealth, all the Commonwealth, realize more and more that we are indeed members one of another, that there are common interests transcending any sectional differences and that broadly we must march together toward the same goal. And I have found everywhere in my visits to Commonwealth countries the realization that together the countries of the Commonwealth and Empire have a strength and power for good, their own and other people's, far greater than any of us could enjoy in isolation. With us in the Commonwealth the paradox is true that the whole is greater than its parts. So I think it is that our interests and tradition all point the same way and in recent years we have stood together in our faith and in our unity.

When we in the United Kingdom and most of the other Commonwealth countries were in grave economic peril we came together in conference. You, in Canada, more happily situated, gave us your counsel and your help. I would like today to just relate something of the story of our recovery and progress at home in the three years since those dark days—and they were very dark days.

I was all through the economic crisis of 1931. I was a Member of the Cabinet that was formed in the National Government. But, frankly, the situation we faced then was child's play compared to the situation we had to deal with at the end of 1951.

Consider for a moment what our position was. Our great reserves of capital were largely exhausted. That was because we had thrown everything into two World Wars. We had to pay as we went. We were running into debt, we were running an adverse trade balance at the rate of over seven hundred million pounds a year. Our reserves were draining away at a perilous rate and the pound was at a discount: you could buy it at a different rate in half a dozen black markets. The world was beginning, I think, to lose confidence in us, though believe me, we never lost confidence in ourselves.

For the Commonwealth Sterling Area as a whole the position was the same. Taking us all together, we were running on the wrong side at a rate of over fourteen hundred and fifty million pounds a year. Well, we took immediate drastic action at home. We did a lot of very unpopular and unpleasant things. But when you have a mortal disease you have got to do pretty drastic things. Sometimes the surgeon's knife is the only way. Well, we did it. We were backed by the rest of the Commonwealth in doing it. In eight months, by the middle of 1952, we had turned the corner. We turned that adverse balance of seven hundred million pounds a year into a balance running well on the right side, and by the end of the year our trade balance was running at the rate of two hundred and seventy millions on the right side. All the other countries of the Commonwealth Sterling Area who had taken counsel with us took the same kind of action, and as a whole they can tell the same story. By the end of 1952 instead of running an adverse balance of fourteen hundred and fifty millions there was something like four hundred and eighty millions up on the right side.

Well, Sir, we have never looked back. We have gone steadily forward. We are still well on the right side, although we are importing more and have greatly liberalized out trade. In spite of the dollar gap which still exists in the trade between Canada and the United Kingdom, we have increased our trade with you. We have freed from import restrictions, from every kind of import restriction, your wheat, coarse grains, soft woods, lead, zinc, nickel and asbestos. We are importing nearly twice as much of your wheat as we did before the war, and we will go on doing that because, fortunately for you, in my country we can't grow hard wheat. The wheat we grow is soft and our people like a lot of hard wheat in their bread and we, being a democratic country, give our people what they want. Certainly we get very full agreement on that. We are increasing our imports of newsprint. We have increased them. I think we shall import another hundred thousand tons next year. We are increasing our imports of chemicals, cheese, and, not uninteresting to this Province, we bought three million dollars worth of apples when the axe went down across the border. I hope we shall still take them in spite of hurricanes.

Now, in some sense, that is an act of faith, because as I say, the trade balance is still very heavily in your favour. Something like a hundred and forty millions sterling . . . I can't do the sum in dollars . . . last year. But it is an act of faith which we believe will be justified by works on both sides. We believe . . . indeed, I think it is self-evident . . . that there is a great and growing opportunity for trade between us. Our two markets are essentially complementary. We need what you can give us and we can give you what you need. You will find our market a steadily increasing outlet for your products. I say we can fulfil your needs. Our position today I think is the best guarantee of that. Our production is the highest it has ever been.

On the export side we can tell the same story. Our reserves which drained away so disastrously are up by over twelve hundred million dollars, and they are up in spite of the fact that we are paying off a lot of dollar debts and that we are doing a great deal of dollar importing. The reserves are up. Confidence is restored. We have abolished controls. We have reopened our great market exchanges like the Liverpool Cotton Exchange and the Metal Exchange to the whole world, and the whole world is doing business at them today. The pound is steady. We can look any currency in the face.

We will never forget what we owed to you in Canada and to your neighbours in the United States "for very present help in trouble". I think we can claim that we have used that aid well, and you can feel that like manna from heaven you have helped those who have helped themselves.

Well, Sir, that is the story. I haven't exaggerated it at all. I think it is a pretty good story of cooperation and success and we may be modestly proud of it. But let me give you this assurance; the last thing we are at home is complacent. There will be no relaxation of effort on our part. We know we face increased competition on all hands. We are not afraid. We know there is no easy road ahead of us and no short cuts. Easy roads mostly lead down hill; but I promise you that we are going on the road which has brought us back from the brink of disaster to where we now are. In all this we have been a united nation and, as I say, we mean to follow that road. We know it means hard work. We are not in the least afraid of that. We know it means increasing our production without raising our costs. We will do that. What do we have? Last year our production was seven per cent up on the year before, and the year before was quite a lot upon the year before that. It has meant selling in competition. The sellers' market is gone forever.

Well, we are facing up to that. Our exports this year, are nine and a half per cent better than last year, and last year was a good deal better than the year before. And we have done that in spite of a downturn in the American economy, comparable to that which in 1949 knocked our economy endways. We have taken it in our stride.

To complete that policy, for its success, we need the development of Commonwealth resources and Commonwealth trade. We want to trade with the whole world. There is no question of choosing whether we trade with the Commonwealth or with the rest of the world. We must do both. Indeed, all past economic history shows that the more we, the countries of the Commonwealth, trade with one another, the more we can trade with the world outside. We have in our country, as you have in yours, great resources, physical, scientific and, I would say, spiritual. We have what is perhaps the best asset of all "goodwill", founded on our unique experience of a century of world trade, merchandising, finance, insurance, shipping and, now, the air. We have that experience. We have the "know-how", and something more . . . a century of integrity. Is not that the real meaning of the "Freedom of the City" London, Liverpool—all our historic marts—the knowledge that business done "on the nod" is as binding as the most formal contract . . . the certainty that any contract or deal will be honoured to the full whether it be to our own interest or not.

Sir, that is a great asset and a priceless heritage. But I wouldn't have you think for a moment that we are just living in the past, relying on the past. We are not doing anything of the sort. We are building on the past a new edifice of all kinds of inventions, improving our old industries and developing the new.

You spoke, Sir, and far too generously, of my share in building up an Air Force in which so many of your best men fought. Well, we won through . . . we had the best fighters as well as the best pilots. I know something of that for I took them all off the drawing board. You mentioned Radar. It is called an American name today but it wasn't an American invention, it was a British invention and for some years it was called Radio Location. I will tell you the story of Radar.

When I went to the Air Ministry I said to the Chiefs of Staff: "Now I am going to bring in some of the greatest scientists in England."

They said, "You mean as advisors?"

I said, "Oh no, I don't mean that at all. I mean they are going to be as much an integral part of the operational staff as you yourselves; they will know everything and they will originate." And there they were, the four greatest physicists of the time, and one day as I was taking a meeting of the General Staff and the scientists, I casually said, "What would be the greatest revolution you could have in he air?"

Somebody, I think it was a young Staff Officer, not one of the great brass hats, said, "Well, Sir, supposing we could know where an aircraft was a quarter of an hour before it got here." That seized all our imagination.

Suppose there need be no patrolling and the fighter could go up with all his petrol on board. He would know where to go and know where to find the enemy. And I said to those great scientists, "Gentlemen, there is your problem."

They deliberately set to work to find the answer to that problem and I asked them a week or two later, "Did you do anything on this?"

They said, "Well, we are on to a line that we think is the most hopeful one."

The consequence was that in an incredibly short space of time the answer was found—Radar.

And by the time the Batttle of Britain came the whole of Great Britain was ringed by radar stations.

Well, that wasn't a bad story. Of course the men who won the Battle of Britain were the pilots and yours were on every figher field. But they couldn't have won it without the machines they flew and the radar which guided them.

There was one thing we had to give up in the war and that was transport aircraft. We were making the best fighters and the best bombers, so we concentrated on these and on transport aircraft we fell behind. But look at the position now . . . we lead the world. Take our modern jet civil aircraft . . . we just can't execute the orders that are coming in from every country, whether this side of the Atlantic or the other for the Viscount. The Comet will be flying again soon. We know what was the matter with it.

Then engines . . . we have led and still lead in the Jet. You already, I am glad to say, are manufacturing on our patents.

Then, another thing connected with the air, that amazing device which is called a Flight Simulator. You know it. You are buying and using it. You have a cabin in which the whole of a crew of an aircraft can be posted and in which every change and chance which that aircraft can encounter is reproduced at the cost of a few cents of electricity. Well, that is another great British invention. You have been buying them for your Air Force here. Other countries in the Commonwealth and elsewhere are doing the same.

I could talk to you about other things like Terylene—I think you call it Dacron over here. We invented it. Rather like Radio Location which became Radar, Terylene becomes Dacron; but it is British all the same.

Now, Gentlemen, I read the reports of companies, and of a great variety of businesses. I read in many annual reports . . . of this or that new process; a variety of inventions all doing well . . . giving greater economy and increased efficiency—and all selling well. These processes and inventions which we are applying in our industries, old and new, are the product of research stations in which if you go and visit them as I have, you find not only the whole of the firm the management and the scientists in industry—but the workmen too are taking a deep interest.

I went and opened an extension a year or so ago in Yorkshire of the great wool research project there and I found it was a cooperative effort of the whole industry. I found the trade union men there were just as keen as was the most efficient firm. That is all very heartening and all this, of course, has been of great value to us.

But it can be and should it not be of equal value to you. Sir, this visit of mine has impressed upon me daily the tremendous opportunity there is for trade, for unfettered, increasing trade between our two countries, and so I would give you this message today: In our common interest let us make this more and more a partnership effort, free, independent, but united. And so it will be said of every country of the Commonwealth, as it was of Britain long years ago, and as it can surely be said about Canada and Britain today, "All our past proclaims our future . . . England still shall stand."

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. Hal Linton, President of The Canadian Club of Toronto.

"BRITAIN GOES OVER THE TOP"

An Address by

THE HONOURABLE GEORGE A. DREW, P.C.
Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition
Government of Canada, Ottawa

Thursday, October 21st, 1954

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: It is a very great pleasure to have as our speaker today one of our own Members, a Past President of The Empire Club of Canada, and a distinguished and public spirited citizen of our great country—The Honourable George A. Drew, P.C., Q.C., M.P., LL.D.

The Honourable Mr. Drew has been active in public life for over 32 years, having been elected an Alderman of his home town of Guelph, Ontario, in 1922, while still in his twenties. Since that time he has served his fellow citizens almost continuously in one capacity or another. He was Premier of the Province of Ontario from 1943 to 1948 and since then has been the national Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada.

The Honourable George Drew is so well known from one end of this country to the other that it would be presumptuous on my part to occupy any more time in formally introducing him to his fellow members. I will assure him, however, of our keen anticipation and interest in his subject, "Britain Goes Over The Top".

MR. DREW: I need hardly tell you that there is a very particular pleasure in coming back here to The Empire Club, of which I have been an active member for so many years. There may be changing sentiments in regard to the use of names but on one thing I know we can all agree, whether we use the word "Empire", whether we use the word "Commonwealth", or whatever the word may be, there is not one of us here who does not welcome the fact that this particular organization exists for the particular purpose of keeping alive to our members, and to others, the immense and abiding value of this fellowship under one Crown. (Applause.)

Before I proceed to discuss the subject that I wish to place before you today, I think it would be only fitting as one who has lived here so long, and as one who has had some association with the activities of Toronto and of the Province, that I should mention something that is very much in the hearts and minds of every one of us. This morning I went through the devastated area where so much tragedy came so unexpectedly at the end of last week. It is truly remarkable the way that everyone is joining hands to help in any way they can to alleviate the suffering of those people who bore the full brunt of the forces of Nature in this wholly unexpected way. I think every one of us welcomes the fact that organizations have been brought into existence which provide a practical opportunity to help in some way those who have lost so much. Nothing will ease the tragedy of those who have lost their dearly beloved members of their own family, but to those who live and have seen their life savings disappear in this way, I feel sure that the Hurricane Relief Fund presents a wonderful opportunity under excellent leadership to give assistance to those who need it so greatly. Certainly a visit to that area impresses anyone who sees it with the urgent need of every assistance that can be given. I feel sure that in this case the response of people of the whole of Canada . . . yes, even beyond Canada . . . will indicate the extent to which all of us realize that this is a common problem in which each one of us will have some privilege to share.

Now, today I have chosen a title which was prompted by some of the things which have happened within recent weeks, and even within recent days. The meeting now taking place in Paris offers a greater hope of the fulfilment of our dreams of peace and security than anything that has happened since the end of this last World War. The high honour yesterday conferred on Sir Anthony Eden . . . and I know that here within the ranks of the members of this Club there will be warm welcome of this announcement . . . does serve to emphasize something of what has been achieved during these past two months. Out of the discouragement which followed the repudiation of the European Defence Community plan has emerged the bright prospect of a European partnership which may well change the whole course of history. Unintentionally, and certainly contrary to their expectations and desires, the men in the Kremlin may have produced a result of immense and lasting benefit to all mankind. The threat of Communist aggression has demonstrated as nothing else could have done, the need of unity in a way that reason alone could never have done. The dark threat to their survival has brought ancient enemies together in the common cause of peace.

Certainly throughout France and throughout the rest of Europe there is plenty of reason to be worried about a rearmed Germany. From southern Britain to the northern boundaries and across the whole frontier along the ancient battle lines of the First World War are cemeteries which remind the people of France and remind us of the price that has been paid to stem German aggression on earlier occasions. Yet, with all that tragedy still so fresh in our memories, it is gratifying to see the evidence that can so easily be found of a belief in the necessity of joining hands throughout the whole of Western Europe to preserve that area in which rests the title deeds of our civilization.

One of the things which emphasizes to me the change that has come about within these past few years was when I watched on television in a small French town the final game in Berne, in Switzerland, of the football championship which was being played between the teams of Germany and Hungary. Certainly it was no reflection on the people of Hungary when the French people watching that in the same room I was in cheered as though this were their own team when the German team won that game against the team from Communist Hungary. It seemed to me in that very simple incident was an expression of the belief that a retention of ancient hatreds may be too great a price to pay for the uncertainty that would exist unless the nations of Western Europe stand together at this time.

Now, these nations seem to be closer together than in a very long period. I like to think back to what happened after the Napoleonic Wars. We are inclined to forget sometimes that those who have been joined in winning the victory at the end of those wars a hundred and forty years ago were confronted with something of the same problem which confronts us today. I am often interested to find how few people, looking at Arc de Triomphe in Paris, certainly one of the central features of the Paris scene, look at the names on the top of the Arc, on the medallions which surmount it. There you will see names from Portugal to Russia. You will see the names of the cities from the whole of Europe and from Africa as well, occupied by the armies of France at that time, under Napoleon. And it might be well to remember that the people of those countries didn't welcome Napoleon's aggression at that time with any noticeable degree of pleasure. In fact, Thomas Jefferson, who was also the first to impress upon his own people their debt to Lafeyette and the Frenchmen who had assisted them, never referred to Napoleon except as "that monster, Napoleon".

I mention this simply to recall that at the end of the Napoleonic Wars, which terminated long years of aggressions, there were those who said that France must not again be permitted to rearm, that France must not again have full sovereignty, and in that way threaten the security and peace of Europe. Many of you will recall that at the time Wellington, who headed the Alliance then represented in Paris, made a very simple statement to his own Government, which had a profound effect. He said, "If we are prepared to move from France then this argument might have some sense, but if France is to be populated by Frenchmen, then surely our purpose must be to gain the friendship of these people and to bring them along the same path as we wish to follow." The Government, not only of Britain but of the Allies, then followed that advice and as a result of that course the greatest historic friendship between France and Britain was established which has been sealed in terms of blood throughout the years that have remained.

Surely in that factor lies some suggestion and some hope of what may occur if the same course is followed in the months and years ahead. Now, it would be very unwise to assume that every hurdle will be cleared at the first drop, but we certainly have great reason to hope that they will be cleared. Who would have thought only two months ago that the Premier of France and the Chancellor of Germany would be meeting yesterday for a friendly discussion of their mutual problems, as they did in Paris. Much remains to be done before any European alliance can in fact take form, but that one incident shows how far we have moved within these past few weeks. If that dream of European unity comes true, and surely we have new reason for confidence that it will, then I think that all of us should remember that it was the leadership of Britain which gave form and substance to that dream. (Applause.) The tireless efforts of Sir Anthony Eden to bring a new spirit of understanding by his visits to the capitals of Europe after the failure of the Brussels Conference in July, deserve the acclaim of free men and women everywhere.

But we would be misinterpreting history, we would be misinterpreting vitally important history, if we failed to recognize that behind the moves which brought the hope of order out of apparent chaos was the towering figure of Sir Winston Churchill. (Applause.) We can devoutly thank God today that the unparalleled wisdom and prestige of the greatest parliamentary statesman of all times was there to meet the challenging demands of this critical hour. Not even his unwavering courage and determination, however, could have created the harmony which now exists had it not been for the new spirit to be found in Britain today which has made her the natural leader of the European Alliance. For all of us who believe that the continuing strength of the Commonwealth from friendly association with the United States, offers the greatest hope of peace and international stability that is a fact of immense importance to every one of us.

The improvement in Europe generally within these past two years has been truly remarkable. The recovery of Germany has been properly described as a miracle, but as we recognize the amazing things that have been done in Germany and France and in Holland and in Belgium and in Austria and throughout the devastated areas generally, let us remember that nowhere has there been a more spectacular change than in Britain itself. If we are to assess correctly the possibilities of the future of this Commonwealth it is necessary that the full measure of Britain's rapidly increasing strength be described. To the many Canadians . . . and there were more this year than ever before . . . who have seen with their own eyes what has been taking place even within these past few weeks, this may seem unnecessary. But it is necessary because there are still very inaccurate impressions being given to our people in articles and statements appearing in responsible publications.

Now, here is one example, and simply to demonstrate to you what a lot of young Canadians, as well as older Canadians, are reading at this time, may I refer to an article which appeared in the current issue of *Reader's Digest* which claims the largest periodical circulation in the world. Now I mention this because the *Reader's Digest* has a very wide circulation in Canada and we assume that what is published is read and is intended to have its effect upon the thinking of those who read what appears in it. In an article written especially for this important publication, David Lawrence has this to say, and I quote words from that article and I would ask you to listen to them carefully: "Horror stories about the A-bomb and the H-bomb have virtually paralyzed with fear the peoples of Britain and France." Well, some of you who have been in Britain in the past few months will recall how little paralysis you saw and how little evidence of fear you saw, and I might say, without any invidious comparison that I read nowhere in the publications of Britain horror stories nearly as terrifying or, shall I add, sometimes unbalanced, as the stories I have read in publications which come to us from the United States. There is no evidence of anything of the kind. But having given that picture of paralysis from fear, and reviewing the problems that this presents to those who are seeking to build a defence against aggression, Mr. Lawrence goes on with these words: "Voices quaking with physical fear do not articulate moral law in convincing tones." Well, anyone who has been in Britain this year knows what preposterous nonsense this is. I never saw any people showing less visible signs of fear than the people of Britain do at this very hour, and whatever their difficulties may be the same is true of France. Can you at one moment imagine Churchill's voice quaking with physical fear, or that of Eden, or Butler or Alexander, or any of the other gallant gentlemen who express in understandable terms the true thought and spirit of Britain at this hour? Yet, when an article of this kind is written for the *Reader's Digest* by the Editor of the influential weekly, *U.S. News and World Report,* we cannot disregard the effect such statements can have on the thinking of our own people as well as the people of the United States and other people who read articles of this kind.

There can be no doubt that the friendly support of the United States is vitally necessary to the common efforts we are all making to preserve peace by preventing aggression. But friendship with the United States will not be firmly established by accepting without challenge dangerous nonsense of that kind, which I merely offer as an example of some of the things that are being read by the people of this country and particularly the younger generation without some of the memory of events which makes it possible for them to challenge the accuracy of what they read.

I have been going to Britain fairly regularly . . . I have been fortunate in that fact . . . since I got a free trip over there nearly forty years ago, and I can say, without any reservation, and I do so with deep earnestness, that never in all those years have I seen the spirit of the people of Britain better than it is at this very hour. (Applause.) After fifteen years of austerity, food rationing ended this year with truly remarkable results. You might perhaps almost think I was guided in my choice of examples by my own interest in food, but after all it is not only an army that moves on its stomach. As we have been told in the past, the way people eat, the evidence of freedom of choice and selection has a good deal to do with the spirit of any people.

Driving through the country a few weeks ago I saw displays of all kinds of foods shown as well as they would be shown anywhere. I was in the lovely southern counties of England and in the shops in the villages and towns I saw displays which would compare favourably with any we would see here or in the United States or anywhere else on this very fortunate continent of ours. This has had an immense effect upon the people of Britain, but it is only the evidence of the greatly improved economy of that country. Britain has in fact gone over the top, and with whatever help they have received they have gone over the top by their own efforts.

John Bull is definitely back on his feet. Industry is humming, plants are being modernized, intensified industrial research is producing new and extremely attractive goods of all kinds and behind this is the rapidly increasing steel production which means so much in any industrial nation. Just to show what has taken place, Britain's steel production has risen from twelve million tons in 1945 to an annual rate of nearly twenty million tons this year. British aircraft are selling in competition with those from the United States, even in their own markets.

We hear so much about the stodgy Britons. Well, I was at the opening day of Farnborough just a few weeks ago and it was extraordinary how fast those stodgy people moved on that occasion. There I saw not prototypes, but types in production which demonstrate the engineering skill of the people in Britain is as great and perhaps greater than it has ever been before. Flying over that field were bombers, fighter aircraft, helicopters, great transport planes, new designs of all types which now are in production on a large scale. Just to show you the kind of thing they are doing, I saw one transport machine, the Blackport, into which a whole lorry can be driven, into which I saw driven not only a field gun with the tractor which towed it, but with the field gun on top of the tractor, and two of those went in to that transport machine.

Then again I saw the new small aircraft which conceivably may revolutionize defence ideas . . . the Midge, which can be made in about a fifth of the time of any of the larger fighters, and which is the prototype of new fighters that are going into production on a large scale. I saw there also machines which are taking their place in the airports of the world, and particularly the Viscount which will soon be flying here in Canada; the Turbo-Jet made by Vickers, which has challenged the great producers in the United States right in their own country. You will recall that just recently very large orders have been placed in the United States for that machine. Soon they will be flying here in Canada with Trans Canada Airways.

I saw the Britannia, the larger version of the Turbo-Jet Transport passenger plane flying there, along with Comet II and Comet III and I think to all of us there must be a great measure of satisfaction that they have definitely found the weakness which caused the problem with Comet I, and that the Comets will be back in commercial service just as soon as these problems have been dealt with, as they are being dealt with, and they again will be taking their place at the forefront of modern aircraft development.

I mention this because it isn't in the carrying forward of old design of high quality that they are doing so well . . . they are breaking new ground in many fields and by that very fact are providing themselves with opportunities to create employment, economic strength and prosperity within their own country that challenges the imagination. I think there is good reason to believe that before long Britain will be meeting the immense new demands for electric power by the peaceful employment of atomic energy. They are today in the forefront of that type of development. The first electrical plant is actually now contracted for and two enormous plants are planned for completion within the next twelve to fifteen years. With all this British workmen are feeling the impact of this employment. Their pay is still below ours, but it is increasing and they are working with an enthusiasm and an efficiency which again demonstrates that they have not forgotten the craftsmanship which made British products famous throughout the world.

These remarks merely attempt to express in capsule form the great strides that have been made, and the confidence in the future which lies behind British leadership in the efforts to bring Europe together, not merely for defence but for their mutual economic advantage throughout the years ahead.

Nor would the successful outcome of these efforts diminish in any way our close association within the framework of the Commonwealth under a single Crown. On the contrary, a European Alliance, such as that now envisaged and being discussed in Paris, could provide us in Canada with immense stable markets for our products which could have a profound effect upon our economy and the rapidity of our growth. I think there is too much tendency to look upon the nations of Europe, particularly the smaller nations, as though they were weak and as though at best we are merely helping to bring them together as partners who would rely upon the great strength of this kind. They need that strength, of course they do, but the fact is that if this alliance of nations in

Western Europe becomes a reality it will be the greatest economic colossus in the world today. We forget that west of the Iron Curtain there are more than three hundred million people, if you include Britain, now so actively engaged in this venture, three hundred million people with centuries of accumulated skill, with great traditions of civic responsibility, with transportation, with resources, and with the markets of the world available to them, brought together in some economic partnership. Those three hundred million people would be more powerful than Russia and all her satellites combined. That is the kind of partnership which challenges the vision and the hope of every one of us at this time. That is the kind of partnership which breaking with the traditions of centuries Britain has now joined to try to create.

You know, we seem unwilling to face the reality of this. I am reminded of a story that I heard not long ago about the difference between a psychiatric and a neurotic. In these days when so many people seem to need psychoanalysis and strange treatment of that kind, it seemed to me this story rather illustrated the point I wished to make. A specialist in this field was asked the difference between a psychiatric and a neurotic. He replied, "a psychiatric is a man who is certain that two plus two equals five and pities you because you don't know. A neurotic is a person who is sure that two plus two equals four but worries about it."

We have in front of us the simple arithmetic of this great Alliance and we seem unwilling to accept the reality of the tremendous possibilities of that association in which we ourselves can play some part by our friendly help and by our trade associations in the years ahead.

Now, to those who have absorbed any of these dismal ideas, conveyed by the articles such as I have read, I hope you will forgive me if I recall the words of a hymn we all know:

"Ye fearful saints fresh courage take,
The clouds ye so much dread
Are yet big with mercy and will break
With blessings on your head."

Here before us is a vision, not merely of the static peace but a vision of a great future that offers to each one of us an opportunity to give the very best we have. There again we come to the old association . . . perhaps one of the things that is most encouraging about life in Britain today is the fact that tradition goes hand in hand with all the material advancement that we see. We may be inclined to forget that of all the large nations in Europe Britain is the only country where the palaces and the great public buildings that have come forward through the centuries are still a living part of the reality of government itself. These palaces are not museums of a dead past . . . they are the place where the beautiful young woman who carries the Crown as the temporal symbol of this great unity of ours lives and expresses our belief in those traditions which have come forward to us, strengthened all the time through the centuries. I am inclined to think that one of the things that has so strengthened the fortitude of the people of Britain at this time is that they see vividly before their eyes on all occasions the reality that these ancient traditions, associated with government and the life of the people, are living, vigorous things. As they see the Queen driving from Buckingham Palace with some state visitor to the Guild Hall or to the Mansion House, out of all the past comes the memory of the greatness that is interwoven in the history of the people. And those traditions are ours . . . those traditions are ours, symbolized by the Queen of our own country who today carries the affection and the love of her own people as no monarch has ever done before and, my friends, carries the admiration and respect of the whole free world at this critical time.

We have heard promise of a new Elizabethan Age. That will not come simply by the fact that a new Elizabeth has come to the throne. It will come as a reality to every one of us if the same spirit of adventure, if the same determination to build these great traditions to new strength which characterized the first Elizabethan era is evident throughout the Commonwealth in these challenging days.

It is for that reason that today I have brought before you these thoughts, that I have placed before you some of the things that are being said, and I have sought to place before you reasons why in our homes and in our schools and in our daily discussions we should place before the people of Canada, and particularly our youth, all that this great fellowship means, all that the traditions of the Crown signify in freedom and honour and decency and then, and then only, shall we see the fulfilment of the second Elizabethan age.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. John Griffin, a Past President of the Club.

"CHALLENGE OF OUR TIME"

An Address by

THE LORD BAILLIEU, K.B.E., C.M.G.
Chairman, Dunlop Rubber Company Limited

Joint Meeting with the Toronto Branch of the English-Speaking Union.

Thursday, October 28th, 1954

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: It is a very great pleasure to have as the speaker at this meeeting one of England's leading industrialists . . . a man who has won international fame as "a master negotiator" . . . The Right Honourable The Lord Baillieu, K.B.E., C.M.G.

Lord Baillieu has been Chairman of the Board of Dunlop Rubber Company Limited, of England, since 1949; Chairman of the English-Speaking Union of the Commonwealth since 1951; a member of the Grand Council and a Past President of the Federation of British Industries; Chairman of Central Mining and Investment Corporation Limited; a Director of Trinidad Leaseholds Limited; Midland Bank Limited, and of many other companies.

Born in Melbourne, Australia, 65 years ago, Lord Baillieu graduated from Melbourne University and then Oxford. He was admitted as a Barrister at the Inner Temple, London in 1914.

During World War I he served with the Australian Imperial Forces and the Royal Air Force. He was mentioned in dispatches and was awarded the O.B.E.

From 1929 to 1939 Lord Baillieu represented the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia on the Imperial Communications Advisory Committee. From 1930 to 1947 he was one of the Australian representatives on the Imperial Economic Committee.

In World War II Lord Baillieu served as an Executive Member of the Export Council, Director-General of the British Purchasing Commission in Washington, Head of the British Raw Materials Mission in Washington, the British representative on the Combined Raw Materials Board, Washington, and as a member of the British Supply Council in North America.

He returned to Britain in November 1943, to act as Chairman of the Fairey Aviation Company from 1943-45. Having been Deputy President of the Federation of British Industries from 1944-45, Lord Baillieu served as President from 1945 to 1947. In 1946 he was Chairman of a Departmental Committee on Establishment of a Central Institute of Management. From 1945-53 he was a member of the National Production Advisory Council on Industry. From 1946-48, a Member of the National Investment Council and from 1947-52 a member of the General Advisory Council of the British Broadcasting Corporation. In 1948 he lead a British Trade Mission to the Argentine.

Having been Chairman of the American and British Commonwealth Association from 1943 to 1947, Lord Baillieu became Deputy Chairman of the combined body on the amalgamation of that organization with the E.S.U. of the Commonwealth in 1947 and served as such until in 1951 he succeeded Lord Wakehurst as Chairman of the English-Speaking Union of the Commonwealth.

Created a C.M.G. in 1929 and K.B.E. in 1938, Lord Baillieu was raised to the Peerage in 1953.

I can assure him that we all await with keen anticipation his address on "The Challenge of Our Time".

Ladies and Gentlemen . . . The Right Honourable Lord Baillieu.

THE LORD BAILLIEU: I was rather nervous when Mr. Joyce was giving you my record—did he really know anything about me that I did not myself? My motto is to move out before you are found out, and that adds to the enjoyment and zest of life.

May I say how pleased I am today to be the guest of this combined gathering of The Empire Club and the English-Speaking Union. It is not only a great saving of your time and of your patience to dovetail these two meetings, but for one who, at times, has to do a great deal of speaking, it is also a very agreeable concession.

I would like to start the few words I would address to you today by saying on behalf of my British colleagues today, how deeply moved we have been by the tragic loss of life and suffering which has befallen the citizens of Toronto as a result of the recent flood. My wife and I and many members of our party have seen something of the trail of destruction and our hearts go out in sympathy to those who have been bereaved and have suffered. At the same time our hearts have been lifted in admiration by the way in which the citizens of Toronto have rallied in the emergency and have brought comfort and aid to those in need. This is the stuff of which great nations are made.

I suppose that most people around here have to make speeches from time to time and when they are asked to do so they are first of all faced with the question, Shall I decline? . . . Shall I accept? . . . Shall I say Yes? . . . Shall I say No?

I am reminded of the story of the difference between the diplomat and the lady. I suppose most of the ladies know it, but for the benefit of the gentlemen perhaps I may have your indulgence. You know, when a diplomat says "Yes" he means "Perhaps". When he says "Perhaps" he means "No". If he says "No" he is no diplomat.

Now, a lady when she says "No", she means "Perhaps". If she says "Perhaps" she means "Yes", but if she says "Yes" she is no lady.

Now, if I had said "No" I would have been no gentleman, because I was very much touched by the invitation I received from these joint Clubs. If, as I have done, I said "Yes", I ran the obvious risk of spoiling a very good luncheon, so I ask your indulgence and here we go.

The next thing of course is to decide what you are going to talk about and having decided that, what you are going to try and say. My Speech is entitled "The Challenge of Our Time". Now, we come to that in a moment, but as you will see, I am billed as Chairman of the Dunlop Rubber Company, and also as Chairman of the English-Speaking Union. I am not here to do a selling line for Dunlop. I am not going to tell my friends here that Dunlop tires, Dunlop golf balls, Dunlop mattresses are the best. Anybody who wants to break 80, anyone who wants to rest on an easy conscience at night, or ride comfortably in the daytime, knows the answers!

But I must say I have been thrilled to see something of my Dunlop colleagues here since I arrived.

I come then to my position as Chairman of the English-Speaking Union, and if I may, I would take time off for just a moment to tell you something of that organization and why it is that hard-boiled people like myself and, my friend here on the right, Colonel Benson, take time off and considerable time off, to lend their voice for what it is worth to the purposes of the Union.

Before saying so, I would interpolate here what a very great pleasure it is to find at our head table this afternoon, Sir Evelyn Wrench, the Founder of the English-Speaking Union. He it was who had the vision in 1918 to create this body which has grown to one of considerable size, is destined I hope to grow much greater, and to exercise an increasingly important influence.

Why is it then that some of us . . . I might say all of us . . . who are linked with the Union give so much time to it? I think it is because in our lifetime we have seen the British Commonwealth and the United States linked in a partnership which has been the foundation of victory in two World Wars and must be the cornerstone of any enduring peace system. It is this basic thought which has moved us to do what we can in our time and generation to carry the implications of that message far and wide.

Let me add here that the Queen is our Patron, that the Duke of Edinburgh is our President, that we are non-party and non-sectarian. Sir Winston Churchill and Mr. Attlee are our Vice-Presidents, the Lord Bishop of Canterbury, His Eminence, Cardinal Griffin, of Westminster, the heads of the Free Churches, the Chief Rabbi, are all members of our Advisory Council. We have linked to our day to day work a number of people of high standing who are governing the proceedings of our main committees. Some of these I shall briefly mention are those on Finance, of which Colonel Benson is Chairman.

There is a Common Purposes Committee, of which Lady Alexander of Tunis is Chairman and a very effective Chairman, too.

The Chairman of our Educational Trust Committee is Mr. Paul Chambers, a Deputy Chairman of the I.C.I. And the Chairman of our Current Affairs Committee is Mr. Francis Williams, who interestingly enough, was Chief Public Relations Officer to Mr. Attlee, when he was Prime Minister.

I just give you that brief picture of the personnel of the government of the Union.

We have been concerned, deeply concerned in England in recent months and years to do three things. First of all, to gather to ourselves the sinews of war in the sense that we must have funds to carry on our work. We started in 1947 by raising a substantial fund. I am glad to say as the result of the drive we have recently made we have received profound encouragement in subscriptions or covenants equal to $600,000 for the next six years.

In addition to that we have been deeply concerned to attract youth to our movement because no home, no club, no institution can live unless the vitalizing flow of youth is coming in from behind and in that I think we are starting to achieve a considerable measure of success. We have, for instance, over 3,000 members in the London Youth Committee. They are very active, not only on the social side, but in all phases of the Union's activity and they are represented on our Executive and Board of

Governors, and we have two of them attending the World Conference, which I will refer to briefly in a moment, in New York next week.

In addition to that we have been concerned to carry the message to the factory door, to both sides of industry, and as far and wide as we can and to that end, we have set up what we call a Current Affairs Committee, headed by Peter Storrs, and advised and supported by a most interesting panel. For instance, we have representatives there of the Trade Union Congress, the Workers' Educational Association, all the great political parties, the Federation of British Industry, the National Union of Manufacturers, the Chambers of Commerce, the Rotary Clubs, and they meet and from time to time they suggest to Mr. Storrs and his working party the subjects which are hurting relations between the two countries. He proceeds to study it objectively, to get at the facts, to provide the speakers when needed, to produce all the literature that is necessary, in the belief that while there must be in this world of ours, diffrences . . . we even have differences in the family . . . there is no need for misunderstanding.

The whole purpose of this experiment, for experiment it is, a promising one as I regard it, is to soften the impact of these differences and at least to remove what very often is serious misunderstanding on both sides.

Now, we are proceeding from here to Ottawa. We shall be holding there the first All Canadian Conference on the E.S.U. We have branches, not only in Toronto and Hamilton, but in Quebec City, Ottawa, Regina, Edmonton and Vancouver. We are hoping to extend our branches elsewhere and we have very good friends, so I am assured, in Halifax, Fredericton, Montreal, Winnipeg, Saskatoon, Calgary and Victoria.

We are hoping that one of the things that will come out of our talks in Ottawa is the organization of a centre which will enable the E.S.U. in Canada to speak as a national body to their friends in the United States and in the United Kingdom.

Next week we go onward to New York where a World Branch Conference will be held at which fifty-four Branches from the British Commonwealth and sixty odd from the United States, will gather together and we will discuss matters of common concern, particularly education activities, publications, current affairs, the extent of our branches and activities generally, and hospitality. There will be a magnificent dinner tendered to the Queen Mother in order to present to her the final story of the movement made by our friends in the United States to collect funds in aid of the King George VI Memorial Fellowship.

We have recently sent this country our first batch of Fellows. They have all been carefully hand picked. They have made an excellent impression and I am told the total collected by the E.S.U. in America will be about half a million dollars. So there you have on both sides of the Atlantic, just over a million dollars raised or in process of being raised, which I think my business friends here would signify a decent credit rating for the E.S.U.

I thought you might be interested in these facts because they touch the life of many of us very intimately.

The challenge of our time? What is it? I believe this to be nothing more or less than the preservation of our freedom.

"We must be free or die, who spake the tongue
That Shakespeare spake; the faith and morals hold
Which Milton held."

and that goes for not only the folks in that Island set in the Northern Sea, but for Britishers and members of the British Commonwealth wherever you find them. It is as true of the two great races who constitute the Kingdom of Canada as it is of the United Kingdom itself. A vast literature in prose and verse has been written round it and great wars have been fought in its defence.

What is freedom? I suggest in simple terms it is nothing more than the old fundamentals . . . freedom of Religion, freedom of Speech, in which of course I include freedom of the Press, freedom of Assembly, freedom from

Arbitrary Arrest and extra legal process, freedom from Want. These fundamentals, based on the rule of law and operating within the democratic process, in which we all believe, are the basic elements of freedom.

My own home lies within a very short distance of Runnymede and there if you go, as some of you may have easily done, you will see on the monuments at either end of the Meads, the following words written:

> "In these Meads on 15th June 1215
> King John, at the instance of
> deputies from the whole community
> of the realm, granted the great
> charter the earliest of constitutional
> documents whereunder ancient and cherished
> customs were confirmed, abuses redressed, the
> administration of justice facilitated, new
> provisions formulated for the preservation of
> peace, and every individual perpetually secured
> in the free enjoyment of his life and property."

I think, and I think possibly the learned Judge opposite might agree, that is as good a summary as we have in the language of the purpose and intent of Magna Carta.

As we know, down the centuries the struggle to preserve freedom continues. It is a struggle against internal as well as external foes, and the ebb and flow of this struggle has vitally affected the character and the composition of the British Commonwealth, and its relations, not only with the Western World and Europe, but especially with the world of the Americas.

I am not concerned, even if I had the time, to trace the history of Freedom. I have briefly defined what I think it to be. Now, on what does its preservation depend? I would suggest, firstly, the rule of law. Secondly, a strong united British Commonwealth. Thirdly, an intimate, an understanding partnership in world affairs between the British Commonwealth and the United States of America and, finally, and this I believe to be crucial, policies deriving from that partnership which will carry confidence and understanding in the young nations now emerging east of Suez, throughout Asia and in Africa, and which will convince them that they have nothing to fear and everything to hope for by joining with us rather than attaching themselves to the Communist bloc.

Let us look, if I may, for a brief moment at each of these in turn. Two World Wars in the course of a generation, and the economic difficulties which of course have followed those wars have inevitably led to a vast increase in the activity and the powers of the state. The powers and responsibilities of the state today touch us all from the cradle to the grave. I think we can say, both in Canada and the United Kingdom and throughout the British Commonwealth, that generally speaking this responsibility has been discharged with wisdom and restraint, but there have been occasions in recent years when Parliamentary and public opinion has been disturbed. You may have noticed the uprising of opinion in what was known as the Crichel Downs case in England, which had its repercussions on the Cabinet there and elsewhere.

We have seen in some of the great bastions of Democracy there has been much irresponsible talk, false charges have been levied, individual rights have been restrained. What a Chief Justice of England called "the new despotism" has sought to act as prosecutor, judge and jury in relation to the subject. We have found an attempt to justify these methods, so repugnant to all our thinking and traditions, by the principle that the end justifies the means. But those who fail to defend liberty will eventually lose it. Eternal vigilance, in my view, is ever the price of Liberty, against all those, both from inside and outside the state, who seek to overthrow the basic freedoms.

Let us, therefore, be wary of all those, who, in the name of freedom, would reproduce in our communities some of the practices of the police state. Let us make sure that every individual has leave to live without leave underneath the law, and in the words of Magna Carta is "perpetually secured in the free enjoyment of his life and property".

The first essential basis of freedom, therefore, is the maintenance of the rule of law. The British communities as a whole must be true to themselves and guard carefully against the insidious injection of doctrines foreign to our thinking and our practice, if we are to continue to make our contribution to the orderly growth of democratic freedom.

Now, my next suggestion was that a basic element in defence of freedom is a strong, united British Commonwealth. Perhaps you will say that there is no need to labour this point. Twice within the course of one generation the British Commonwealth has rallied under the leadership of Britain in the defence of Freedom and to our lasting credit let it be said we were in the van . . . we were first in the fray and not until the cause of Freedom was won did we sheathe the sword.

I would not weary you with any detailed analysis of the position and prospects of the British Commonwealth as a whole, but I think as members of that Commonwealth we can observe with pride its flexibility and its capacity to achieve great changes without violent ruptures or upheaval. Marshal Smuts, one of the greatest of our Commonwealth statesmen, once described the British Commonwealth as the "greatest human experiment in political organization, the proudest political structure of time". History, I believe, will confirm the appreciation.

Look at the picture today. We have within the confines of the Commonwealth two great Republics,—Pakistan and India. We have six Kingdoms,—Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Ceylon, South Africa, and finally, the United Kingdom. And on the periphery we have a vast dependent responsibility—self-government—and the heart and core of this unique system still remains Britain. The Crown remains the symbol of the free and voluntary association of its peoples, dedicated to the closest human co-operation. Within this vast collection of races and creeds, comprising the British Commonwealth, you find today clear evidence of that higher loyalty to a supra-national ideal, that community of nations, the growth of which I am assured is the best prevention of war between nations themselves.

Britain is the heart, not only of this great constitutional and political group, but of the sterling area and it is around that area, on that currency, as you know, that half the trade of the world revolves and to which is attached the fortunes of at least a quarter of the human race.

How then does Britain look? It is well for us to recall here the basic facts of her position, which are clearly understood by her leaders both in the political and industrial field. She knows her dependence on imports for two-thirds of her food and the bulk of her raw materials.

She knows she must pay for these by exports of manufactures which will compete in price and quality with the world.

She knows that her standard of living, her way of life, her position as centre of the British Commonwealth, the employment and happiness of her people, depends upon the productivity and efficiency of British Industry, and this is why her leaders have deliberately and consciously set out to widen and not to narrow the area of agreement on these issues upon which the progressive improvement in Industry depends.

There has been a conscious and deliberate effort by Britain, supported by the leadership of both parties, and from both sides of industry, to do everything within their power to reduce differences and to project their common action along common lines. You have had the Joint Industrial Council, the National Advisory Council, on which I was privileged to serve, the Administrative Staff College, the British Institute of Management, the British Productivity Council, the Dollar Export Board, and the widening rapid growth of our technological institutes, all working to that end, all going to prove the determination of British Industry to play its part in maintaining Britain's position at the center of the Commonwealth. In that, our opposite numbers in Industry, the leaders of the T.U.C. are just as active on these various bodies as myself and others on our side of Industry. The British Productivity

Council is today chaired by a leading Trade Unionist, Mr. Tom Williamson, and a very good Chairman he is.

I am not going to burden you with statistics. You know in 1951 we were running astern to the tune of four hundred millions a year. Since then there has been a grand come around. In the following year, our surplus was running at about two hundred and fifty-five millions. In 1953 and 1954 we were still running with a surplus of about two fifty to three hundred millions, which gave us the capacity to act as a central banker, to repay our debts and help develop the Empire abroad.

Now that come-around was achieved as a result of pretty severe import restrictions, by the restoration of what you regard and I regard as orthodox monetary restraint, by improvement in the terms of trade and also by the receipt of Defence Aid. Today it looks as if production and employment have risen. Export demand continues firm. Consumer expenditure has continued to rise and the gold and dollar reserves have continued the slow climb they started in 1952.

I think it is a fair thing to say that a review of all the economic indicators point to the conclusion that the expansion that got under way in 1952 and 1953 is continuing and this is a very vital and important fact for you and for my native country, Australia, and the rest of the Commonwealth. Unless you have a sound and stable Britain at the heart of the Commonwealth, then our task, your task, and the task of the rest of the Commonwealth is going to be very much more difficult.

Now may we turn for a moment to the importance of common British Commonwealth-United States joint action in the wide field of world affairs, that I suggest to you is a third great factor in the support of our freedom. I believe the events of the last nine months will constitute an outstanding record, not only in British diplomacy, but in collaboration between the British Commonwealth and the United States.

Let us look briefly at the picture. The cease fire in Korea and Indo-China . . . the settlement in Iran . . . a settlement in Egypt . . . a settlement in Trieste and an amazing achievement in the Nine Power Conference. Now, that is a great tribute to the diplomats on both sides and you, my Canadian friends, must be greatly heartened by the proud role which Canada has played throughout in some of the most vital of these talks and these achievements. "Mike" Pearson happens to be an old wartime friend, and I have admired the way he has handled himself and has helped to guide your great country, since he took the helm at the office of External Affairs. It is significant that Canada is playing this vial role on the world stage. She is not only interesting herself in affairs in Canada, she is playing a vital part in the Far East. Her representatives there are trying to work out the details of the Indo-China Agreement. She was an active participant in many of the great talks, and particularly in the Nine Power Conference.

So when people say to me, "Oh, I am very sorry for the world position today . . . We are in a tough spot . . . there's Formosa and China . . . you are on a spot with the Americans in regard to convertability" . . . I say, "Stop a moment, let us look at all this. What about China? It is true we recognize China in Great Britain and the Americans haven't, but Canada hasn't, Australia hasn't, New Zealand hasn't, and South Africa hasn't. Are you going to sugggest because these other countries haven't done so, that the British Commonwealth is going to break up, because if you do, I am going to tell you you are wrong. You had better take time, my friend, to work out these great issues. You had better remember it took nine years to get this agreement over Egypt. It took four years in regard to Iran, and four years in regard to Trieste. So let us be patient, one with the other, praising our common achievements, acknowledging our differences, but working constantly and purposefully to achieve agreement in the spheres in which we find differences exist. We need not think the whole world is going to collapse around us and that the main pillars of freedom upon which we depend, the Anglo-American working partnership, is going to crumble under us, just because we have some difficulties in the way."

I have no doubt that this great partnership will continue. I have no doubt it will continue because of the position of Canada as an interpreter, not only to the United States but to the British Commonwealth and the world. You have a greater responsibility, a greater challenge, I believe, than almost any country in the Commonwealth.

Then the fourth pillar of freedom to which I referred was the importance of dealing wisely,—profoundly—carefully, with these emerging nations in Africa and in the Far East, and the whole of that vital area east of Suez which constitutes for us the raw material strategic axis of the modern world. If we are denied access to this area, if it falls into unfriendly hands, then we have lost the battle of the future. We can only win that battle if we succeed in attracting into our orbit those ancient peoples who are now emerging as modern states and nations. They have naturally the fears pressing them that perhaps what is called the old colonial system may be revived. Of course, it won't, but we have got to demonstrate that it worked and indeed that they have more to gain from us than they have from the doctrine of Communism. I believe it can be done. There again, it needs time and patience. There again I suggest Canada has a special challenge in interpreting her great neighbour of the south to these Asian folks.

Now, I must draw to a close. But in doing so there is generally one point in a theme which constitutes the center. I feel, as an Australian, that the vital core in the structure of the British Commonwealth still remains Britain. You have had many speeches about Britain, I should say, in the last twelve months. I believe she is in pretty good heart, in good hands and in good shape. (Applause.) Despite the trials and tribulations through which she has passed in the last fifty years, Britain, believe me, is still young in spirit and outlook. When she looks back on those fifty years she has seen vast developments which have changed, as we all here know, the social and economic structure of the world . . . the internal combustion engine, aircraft, radio, the entire field of domestic electrical appliances, synthetic fibres, plastics, reinforced concrete, tele-communication, etc. She knows this impetus still exists over a vast field. She is aware she is living on the edge of the fascinating uncertainties and deeper chanlenges of the atomic age. She realizes she will have to adjust herself to those changes, and that the changes she may face will be as far-reaching in the next fifty years as they have been in the past fifty years.

Scientific specialization will increase. Life will become more complex. Industry and Government will have more and more difficult problems to solve. It will place a greater and greater demand on our scientists, our administrators and our business leaders and technologists to simplify and make more fool-proof the actual operation of the system which supports our modern society. Knowing this, she will, as she has in the past, face the need for change.

It was Disraeli who said that "In a progressive country change is constant; and the great question is not whether you should resist change, which is inevitable, but whether the change should be carried out in deference to the manners, the customs, the laws, the traditions of the people, or in defence to abstract principles and arbitrary and general doctrines".

Britain still remains the center of that free and voluntary association of peoples, united in loyalty and allegiance to our gracious Queen, and which under Britain's protective mantle has grown to self-government and free nationhood, in the course of a hundred and fifty years. For me the most outstanding feature of Britain is the continuing character of her people. In Britain there is an underlying moral unity which transcends every difference of creed or colour or race. This has been the spiritual source of her strength and greatness as a world power. I believe, as a Britisher, that this will still carry her and the Commonwealth to levels of even greater achievement. Believing this, as I do, and believing history is only a prologue, may

I finish by reading you some lines, written I think about a hundred years ago by a great American, Ralph Waldo Emerson. In writing of Britain, he says:

"I see her not dispirited, not weak, but well remembering that she has seen dark days before; indeed, with a kind of instinct that she sees a little better in a cloudy day, and that in storm of battle and calamity she has a secret vigour and a pulse like cannon. I see her in her old age, not decripit, but young and still daring to believe in her power of endurance and expansion. Seeing this, I say, All hail, Mother of Heroes, with strength still equal to the time; still wise to entertain and swift to execute the policy which the mind and heeart of mankind require at the present hour, and thus only hospitable to the foreigner, and truly a home to the thoughtful and generous, who are born in the soil. So be it! So let it be!"

And so, Ladies and Gentlemen, it will be.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by the Rev. C. H. Dickenson, President of the Toronto Branch of the English-Speaking Union.

"RAILWAY HIGHLIGHTS"

An Address by

DONALD GORDON, ESQ.

Chairman President, Canadian National Railways

A Joint Meeting with The Canadian Club of Toronto.

Thursday, November 4th, 1954

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

Mr. Hal Linton, President of The Canadian Club of Toronto, introduced the speaker.

MR. LINTON: To introduce our speaker of today, it is difficult to use anything but superlatives. Words and phrases such as these seem to attach themselves to Donald Gordon—sincerity, courage, energy, drive, mental capacity, ability to think things through, a leader who inspires others to get things done. Let me remind you of the main steps in his Horatio Alger career:

—First, the formative years here in Toronto in the Bank of Nova Scotia, where he rose at the age of 29 to be assistant manager of the main office, having started at the lowly job of clerk.

—Then, having caught the eye of Graham Towers, to Ottawa and the Bank of Canada.

—Next, chosen to set up the Foreign Exchange Control Board.

—Then to the Wartime Prices and Trade Board when his great ability first became known to and appreciated by the public.

—Back to the Bank of Canada after the War.

—and at the beginning of 1950 Canada's Number One Problem Job, President of the Canadian National Railways.

But enough of that, as he himself would say.

When a man who has made his mark in the outside world returns to his home town, his friends think not only of what he has accomplished, but of what he was like when he was among them. For example, Donald Gordon will always be remembered in this city for the period when he was learning and practising the art of public speaking. When he was with the Bank of Nova Scotia, the bankers association organized a course in public speaking and carried it on in co-operation with the Extension Department of the University of Toronto. After a year of that, Mr. Gordon and a few others felt that the course was so beneficial to them that in 1932 they formed the Thirty Club, an organization that is still active, meets regularly in the Board Room of the Canadian Bank of Commerce and over the years has given an opportunity for self-improvement to many men of this city.

I'm told that when the "member for Aberdeen" stood up to speak in the Thirty Club there was always much ribbing and heckling, but with his forthright manner and his Scotch wit no one ever spoke him down.

I am also told that after he moved to Ottawa his interest in public speaking continued because, busy though he was, he became president of the Ottawa Canadian Club and holds the record of being one of the finest presidents that club ever had.

Gentlemen of the Empire and Canadian Clubs, I now give you the president of the largest railway in North America, a big man with a big job, Mr. Donald Gordon.

MR. GORDON: It is a happy occasion for me to be here today and to have the opportunity of speaking, in effect, to two audiences at once. I appreciate your kind invitation. As leaders of your community, your active interest in Canada's railways is of the greatest importance.

Most adult Canadians, when they think about railways, recognize that they are important features of our economy, that they have many advantages as movers of goods, that they have been with us for a long time, and are likely to be with us even longer. Scarcely a day passes without some item of interest about the activities of railways being reported in the press. We read of actual or proposed changes in freight rates, of curtailment or enlargement of services, of new equipment, of labour agreements and so on. The impact of railway actions taken from time to time is discernible in much of our business and personal life.

Today I want to give you some further food for thought but in doing so I will not address myself to any one aspect of railways. I will, rather, try to give you a broad sweep of the business in which I am one of your representatives. The individual parts of the picture that get publicized from time to time are often meaningless or distorted unless they are set against the background of the whole.

A review of railway highlights on an occasion such as this must of necessity be brief. I shall have to leave out fine points, since details would tend to dilute the antidote to fragmentary thinking about railways which I want to administer to you. It will be no surprise, I am sure, that my remarks concern primarily the Canadian National Railways. Let me invite you, therefore, as joint owners and users, to consider the major problems that face the CNR today.

Our basic task is to ensure that the CNR is an efficient, successful business organization as well as a good servant of the public. Broadly speaking, like any other business organization we face the problem of balancing revenues against costs to yield a profit. Leading aspects of this challenge can be seen in our wage bill, in the sources of factors bearing on the growth and shrinkage of our nationwide rail system. If you have an understanding of this complex situation, then the reading of a newspaper story, the purchase of a ticket, or the shipment of a carload of freight will take on a more intelligible significance.

Historical perspective is necessary to understand the CNR's future as a solvent business enterprise. The CNR is a public enterprise as a result of historical accident. It does not represent a "socialist experiment" undertaken by a government seeking to apply a collectivist philosophy. You will recall that, after the first world war, the government of the day was *compelled*, by the national emergency of several virtually bankrupt railways, to devise a plan for keeping them in operation. The objective was to preserve a network of rail service for Canadians and to protect the credit standing of Canada from the results of the default of railway securities which in many cases had been sold on the strength of government guarantees.

The CNR reflects a decision to achieve this objective in the most businesslike way possible. It is an organization established on exactly the same lines as an ordinary business enterprise. The only difference is that the CNR's shareholders are the people of Canada, represented for most purposes by the Governor-in-Council.

In the three decades of our history as a national railway company, we have, in addition to our earnings, acquired funds both through Parliament and from the public money market by means of government-guaranteed bond issues. These funds met deficits arising from interest charges on huge debts inherited from predecessor companies, enabled us to consolidate overlapping, rundown lines into a rational system, and in general to provide Canadians even in sparsely settled areas with a continental network of low cost transportation. Our unprofitable branch lines have always been one of the distinguishing reflectors of the impact of national economic policy on the CNR. They eat up our profits because their users do not pay their full costs. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy for the record that the Canadian National Railways System, since its inception in 1923, has never failed to meet its actual operating expenses out of its own earnings.

The history of the CNR then is one of continuing compromise between the maintenance of far-flung service and the planning of profitable operations. The influence of our varied rate structure, under which our service is rendered, is very pervasive. Like customs tariffs, our rail rates have affected the location of industry and the size of market areas. The resulting pattern of investment is one that millions of Canadians have a strong personal interest in preserving. It is not something to be tampered with lightly in the short run. Canadian economic history as a whole can, in fact, be viewed as a balancing of factors contributing to flexibility on one hand and stability on the other. Flexibility is necessary for efficiency and stability for security, but the two are inseparable. The CNR is constantly striving for the flexibility needed to maintain a successful business organization, within the requirements of stability of service.

Even within the requirements of stability of service, we operated up until two years ago under the severe financial handicap of heavy debt charges inherited at birth from our original component companies. In 1952, as you will recall, Parliament approved a recapitalization plan which relieved us of part of the old burdens, and gave us a debt structure more comparable to that of an ordinary company. As a result, our true earning capacity was more faithfully revealed in 1952 and 1953 by a modest profit. We were at last breaking even and we had renewed hope that, taking the lean years with the good, we would be able to hold up our heads and build up the confidence of the public and the morale of our employees.

This year's operations, however, are a reminder to us that the capital revision was not in itself enough to give our business future a favourable colour. Like other Canadian and American railways, the CNR has suffered a sharp decline in freight revenues.

Present indications are for a revenue decline in 1954 of not less than $60 million below 1953. Despite far-reaching efforts to reduce costs, it is likely that we shall fail to meet our interest charges on outstanding debt by at least $25 million. I need hardly say that such a result viewed against the efforts of the CNR organization is a crushing disappointment. From a managerial point of view it takes a stout heart to prevent discouragement from sapping our will-power to meet the challenge of the future. Be that as it may, I do not preach defeatism and I refuse to translate the verdict of this year's operations into a gloomy forecast for the future. Far from it. The CNR management is dedicated to an unshakeable resolve to make their railway pay its way like any other Canadian corporation. It will be profitable if human ingenuity and determination can make it profitable.

Nevertheless, a heavy annual loss in a relatively prosperous year is a reminder to the CNR that in spite of our unique history and special place in the Canadian economy, our business future is a straightforward question of costs versus revenues. It is not enough that we merely cover our operating expenses, nor that we merely break even after all financial as well as operating expenses are met. We should be able to rise above borderline solvency and plow some earnings back into capital improvements. Our having to borrow money each year for capital financing means that each year we face bigger interest charges. Obviously, either our costs have to go down or our revenues go up. There are no magic solutions to such economic problems.

Naturally the spectacular decline in freight traffic I have mentioned has drawn attention to the revenue side of our immediate situation, but we would be myopic indeed not to acknowledge that cost factors are of equal importance. Even if the present reasonably favourable outlook for the Canadian economy in 1955 is justified by events, all indications point to a continuing, if lessening, decline in railway earnings. The CNR is going to have to trim its costs even further than it has or face another annual deficit.

More than most other Canadian businesses we have been suffering from a severe squeeze between rising costs and revenues held down by less elastic railway rates. Our physical plant and operating efficiency are good by any standard. They have never been better than they are right now. But every improvement we have made has gone either to our employees as higher hourly earnings, which have risen 132% since 1939, or to our customers through the maintenance of a relatively low level of rates—our revenues per ton-mile of freight have risen only half as much as wholesale prices in the same period. These groups not the company, have been plucking the fruits of increasingly efficient management. Our problem is essentially to get into our own orchard for a share of the crop.

In its relatively large wage bill, the CNR faces the challenge of the high-wage society. We have no choice but to accept it. To maintain our power to compete for desirable employees in the labour market and to ensure harmony in our labour relations, the CNR must keep up with Canadian wage scales. In such a dilemma our only realistic recourse is to strive to reduce labour costs per unit of output, a technique which has been dramatically successful in many manufacturing concerns.

Broadly speaking, I see two lines of approach to the reduction of our labour costs per unit of transport service —first, technological development, or new "tools of the hand"; and second, managerial progress, or new "tools of the mind". Many new projects of course, involve both of these elements.

On the first point, I cannot predict what technological developments will be exploited to make railways more efficient. Who knows, we may even have atomic power in our locomotives before the century has run its course! Already the acquisition of diesel locomotives has resulted in a reduction of our operating expenses, as compared with steam costs, of about $85 million. By 1957 this reduction may well reach $145 million and will represent a saving of about $35 million a year, a 20% return on our investment in the equipment. Fuel costs on diesels are from one-third to one-half what they are on steam locomotives and they have the additional advantage of being able to run many more hours each day, even if the seductive charm of the diesel klaxon has proved fatal to the occasional bull moose. Improvements in terminals and traffic control have raised our efficiency. New developments are continually being churned up for consideration, and I am glad to report that the CNR is keeping abreast of progress in this field of technological development.

On the side of managerial progress, we all have much to learn in the elusive art of forging new "tools of the mind". These tools have to be strong, in many cases, to shatter the chains of administrative tradition, especially where these have become in effect, bonds of love. Organizations the size of the CNR, with about $3 billion in assets, and a labour force of 125,000 pose special problems in human relations. Of primary importance in such large concerns is their "structure"—the skeleton of lines of authority, job specifications, and the relationship of one office to other offices. The CNR is pushing ahead its programme of rationalizing its structure. We are drawing new functional charts to help us study our organizational problems. We are building up a new, highly mechanized personnel records system to give us more up-to-date information on the number and disposition of our various classes of employees. A statistical planning team is searching for ways to develop more current and better indicators of our costs. Our executive and other training programmes are designed to help keep the CNR supplied with capable employees at all levels. One of the most encouraging features of our training is the co-operation we are developing, through it, with our trade unions.

I would like to stress the need we see for a *professional* approach to administration, both in planning and in supervision. Enthusiastic amateurs are not enough. The professional administrator must be a man of action and also a thinker who can exploit his experience in solving new problems without too many self-doubts and without wasting time.

Here, then, is our technological and managerial strategy for coping with our large wage bill. It does not envisage "defeating" our employees either individually or in groups. On the contrary it welcomes their co-operation in developing new instruments for service and new methods of eliminating the administrative confusion which make people unhappy in their work. Over the years we believe this approach must pay off in increased returns for our wage dollar. It will help ease the pressure of costs. It is our response to the challenge of the high-wage society.

Turning now to the revenue side of our cost versus revenue coin, I must say we face a more imponderable picture, one less amenable to solutions of the CNR's own devising. Our freight traffic is the mainstay of our system. It produces about three-quarters of our revenues. Both it and our passenger service pose special problems, and both are squeezing us relentlessly.

In freight competition the railways are in a paradoxical situation. We depend on the top twenty-five percent of CNR freight traffic to carry our uneconomic operations. The paradox of transportation is that highway transport trucks, whose costs are from two to five times ours in proportion to distance, have been cutting into this crucial high-rate traffic. It is not that trucks carry so much. For-hire carriers moved only 9% of 1952 road-rail freight. But the revenue they earned doing it was 25% of total road-rail freight receipts. We need some of this revenue to ease the pressure of costs. Our problem is to get it.

If the railways are to survive as a healthy and solvent industry they must be able to cut freight rates on traffic vulnerable to truck competition and bid to regain lost business. The Montreal-Toronto freight rates recently announced are a case in point. I want to make it very clear that these new rates are not loss rates. They more than cover railway costs and they are competitive rates. We were moving virtually no goods at the old Montreal-Toronto rates and we expect to make money, not lose it, as a result of the recent reductions. Any increase in this particular traffic yields us net profits.

Such additional revenue as we get from rate reductions will help relieve the pressure of rising costs. This explains the apparent contradiction, which has been mentioned in the press, between our cutting certain freight rates while at the same time resisting further wage increases. We hope to be in a better position to meet our existing wage bill

REV. CANON V. J. PIKE MEETING. *From Left to Right:* Colonel F. N. Ovens; Brigader R. L. Purves; Rev. W. J. Gallagher; Rev. Paul Eydt; Rev. W. Harold Young; Major General The Rev. Canon V. J. Pike; The President, James H. Joyce; Rt. Rev. A. R. Beverley; Rev. J. G. Murdock; Rt. Rev. F. H. Wilkinson; Rev. R. F. Sneyd; Brigader W.

The President, James H. Joyce and Immediate Past President, A. E. M. Inwood.

DONALD GORDON MEETING. *From Left to Right:* R. A. Stapells; The President, James H. Joyce; Donald Gordon; D. C. Gaskin; The President of the Canadian Club of Toronto, Hall Linton; J. A. Northey. The figure is the

GORDON R. MCGREGOR MEETING. *From Left to Right:* W. Barron; Gordon R. McGregor; The President, Mr. James H. Joyce (partially concealed); Tracy E. Lloyd; V. H. Fulcher.

OF
CANADA
CBC

J. B. McGEACHY MEETING. *From Left to Right:* The Hon. J. Keiller Mackay; The President, James H. Joyce: J. B. McGeachy.

MRS. OGDEN REID MEETING. *From Left to Right:* Rev. Canon C. A. Moulton; The President, James H. Joyce; Mrs. Ogden Reid; Mrs. George McCullagh.

out of additional revenue coming from traffic secured by these rate reductions although, I regret to say, this revenue will not be anywhere near large enough to offset the effects of the 1954 decline in general freight volume.

Let me turn now for a few minutes to our passenger revenues which constitute our second major income problem although they equal only about one-tenth of our freight receipts. Even with allowance for the fact that freight and passenger trains share railway facilities the railways still lose many millions of dollars each year by being in the passenger business. To put the matter bluntly, human freight is a losing proposition all over North America. It is particularly unprofitable in Canada, which leads the world in its number of miles of track per capita, and where an increasing preponderance of inter-city personal travel is by automobile or bus.

However, it is part of our public duty to provide a passenger service and so we are in it to stay, apart from seeking to abandon exceptionally unprofitable trains. Consequently, if we are to cut our losses we must increase our volume. We are doing many things in an effort to meet that objective. Standards of safety and comfort make our passenger equipment expensive, but our $59 million worth of new passenger equipment is first rate. We hope to attract more traffic with it and retire old, unpopular rolling stock. We know our dining car service is too expensive to be popular despite the fact we lose money on every meal served. Here again, however, we are changing equipment and service in an effort to reduce prices and encourage volume patronage. With improved schedules we hope to add to the advantages of dependability and comfort available on a good train. The ability of railways to carry people under adverse climatic conditions has already earned us many "foul weather friends". What we need is a new group of fair weather friends, and they would be most welcome.

The broad problem of the peak load explains the seemingly unavoidable losses in passenger traffic. There has to be enough equipment for busy periods. This means a large investment in rolling stock. Then, at off-peak volume, equipment lies idle, revenues plummet, and the carriers lose money. This is especially true of equipment in suburban service for commuters, which is utilized only in rush hours.

I want to interject here a comment on our commuter rail service, which is sometimes criticized. All railways are keenly aware of the value of good public relations and naturally would like to meet all demands for service. We do the best we can, and have made recent and expensive improvements in, for example, equipment on the Oakville-Toronto run. But even the recent 100% fare increases will not meet our costs. A full year under the new fares will still leave us about $200,000 short of even out-of-pocket expenses on the Oakville-Toronto run alone. And this figure excludes general system charges which by rights this line should also share. How far can a national system go in subsidizing suburban life? I feel that the metropolitan areas are going to have to solve their own transportation problems in the long run and the CNR is anxious to do all it can to co-operate with metropolitan authorities on this problem. Railways are not designed nor intended to provide service for short-haul passenger traffic. At present we are in effect using a steam roller to crack walnuts.

So far I have spoken of our management programme, our freight rate aims, and our passenger service from the cost and revenue standpoints, but I have been discussing these as if the CNR were a system of one fixed size. In fact is is growing and shrinking here and there, and over the years is very dynamic. Consequently, I must say something about our policy on branch line extension and abandonment—our participation in Canadian economic development—which understandably arouses controversy when the dreams or ambitions of people are curbed by economic realities.

Our policy on branch line or other rail extension is quite clear. We accept the responsibility of providing needed rail facilities wherever we are the logical railway to do so, provided the new line is economically justified. We are constantly on the lookout for new opportunities of growth and for collaboration with businessmen who are considering new industrial locations. New branch lines are usually characterized by initial deficits, which we are prepared to accept for a reasonable period. Even where our analysis of traffic potential reveals poor prospects, we may underwrite part of the cost of a new line if other interests, for example the federal or provincial government, are prepared to provide the rest of the required capital. I feel that these "partnerships" are a good illustration of fruitful collaboration between business and government for developing Canada's wealth.

Similar problems arise as our research reveals trains or branch lines becoming a serious drain on our treasury. History places a heavy hand on us when we seek to abandon service. We do so only when our analysis of all traffic factors fails to reveal justification for continuing. But we must surely be allowed to adjust ourselves to economic decay and to rising competition as well as to new opportunities for sound growth. The Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada has to approve abandonments. The railways cannot stop service on their own authority. But the important thing is not the legal procedure; it is the result achieved. Unless we have flexibility here we cannot meet the larger issues of over-all costs and revenues.

All the various aspects of the CNR I have mentioned—our large wage bill with its demand for progressive management, our freight and passenger revenues which reflect the pressures of competition, and our branch line programme which gives us a key role in economic development—all of these are part of one continental corporation which is striving for a future of financial success as well as public service.

You may ask, "Why should the CNR make a profit?" I would answer that it must do so if it is to reach peak efficiency and provide Canadians with a maximum of service for their transportation dollar. The fact that the

CNR is publicly owned is irrelevant to this proposition. Efficiency is not basically a question of ownership but of operating philosophy and employee morale. We North Americans live in a sociological climate steeped in the traditions of business. In this climate of enterprise, employees at all levels of business can understand a demand for productivity and see the need for business controls to measure and encourage it. But exhortations from an executive officer are a poor substitute for the discipline of a profit and loss account, without which administrative problems are robbed of both urgency and clarity.

The history of transportation, especially outside North America, displays ample evidence of the deadening effect which a steady diet of losses and an insatiable demand for uneconomic service can have on railway efficiency. It not only raises transport costs to the public; it tends to debilitate management.

As far as Canada is concerned, we depend on the competition of two large railways, one of which is privately owned, to keep our railway industry on its toes. If railway rate and traffic conditions were such as to condemn the CNR to an endless series of annual deficits, it is not likely that the privately-owned company could long survive as a railway. Those who contend that CNR deficits are unimportant and indeed are to be encouraged are really arguing for the abandonment of both initiative and private enterprise in the railway business in Canada. For many reasons I believe that would be disastrous for those who look to the railways for their livelihood and for those who depend on them for service. The formula for happiness or misery stated by Charles Dickens through the mouth of the inimitable Micawber is as true of a railway as it is of an individual. Revenue simply must exceed expense or misery follows. Without the profit margin there is little incentive to efficiency and no yardstick of its achievement.

I verily believe that no country has more exciting prospects of material development than this goodly land of Canada. That development will not be entirely for the selfish gain of its nationals, for Canada has given abundant evidence of willingness to make material as well as cultural contributions to less favoured nations who want her help. No industry can contribute more than our railways to building Canada's future, for they remain unchallenged as the work horse of our transportation network.

It follows, therefore, that the current problems of railways, the highlights I have called to your attention, merit the intelligent deliberation of all thoughtful citizens and that the efforts of those entrusted with the task of meeting them should be accorded the support of an enlightened public opinion.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. James H. Joyce, President of The Empire Club of Canada.

"THE FARNBOROUGH SHOW"

An address by

GORDON R. McGREGOR, ESQ.
President, Trans-Canada Air Lines

Thursday, November 18th, 1954

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: We are delighted to welcome as our speaker today, Mr. Gordon R. McGregor, O.B.E., D.F.C., President of Trans-Canada Air Lines.

Born in Montreal 53 years ago, Mr. McGregor studied Engineering at McGill University. His interest in aviation dates back to 1932 when he became a flying student at Kingston Flying Club. Three years later he won the Webster Trophy, annually presnted to the best amateur pilot in Canada. He won it again in 1936 and in 1938.

A year before the Second World War broke out, Mr. McGregor joined No. 115 Auxiliary Squadron, R.C.A.F. and in 1939 he left his position with the Bell Telephone Company at Montreal to go on active service.

He had a distinguished war record, being awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for his efforts during the Battle of Britain. During that crucial period, he destroyed five Nazi aircraft and shared credit in destroying a sixth.

He was also awarded the Order of the British Empire in 1943, the Order of Orange Nassau by the Netherlands, the French Croix de Guerre and the Czechoslovakian War Cross.

Mr. McGregor joined T.C.A. in 1945 as general traffic manager and was appointed president on February 2, 1948. His contribution to the study of traffic problems confronting the air transport industry earned for him the Chairmanship of the International Air Transport Traffic Conference held in Brazil in 1947. In 1949 he was elected a member of the Executive Committee of the I.A.T.A. and in the fall of 1952 was elected president of that organization.

Mr. McGregor will speak to us on "The Farnborough Show", an outstanding annual British air show from which he has just recently returned.

MR. McGREGOR: Your invitation to speak to you today on the Farnborough Air Show is very much appreciated, but the subject was a matter of some concern, because what has come to be known as *THE SHOW* is of absorbing interest to aviation people, but even now in spite of its world-wide reputation, may not be of general interest.

With that word of warning, I will do my best to describe what in reality is one of the world's great Trade Fairs.

Any talk on the Farnborough Air Display (to give it its official title) should include at least a brief historical sketch.

Farnborough itself is one of the oldest purely military aerodromes in the United Kingdom. It has been the home of the Royal Aircraft Establishment since the very beginning of that organization, which was started when free balloons were regarded as a military weapon.

At Farnborough there has been done all the research, development, experiment and proving work on "flying machines" sponsored by the Royal Air Force but not contracted for by individual manufacturers.

Several aircraft types, such as the BE-2C used in the 14-18 War were born at Farnborough.

The Establishment has figured prominently in the Press recently as the organization entrusted with the difficult and exacting task of carrying out the investigation of the Comet accidents. That investigation is undoubtedly the most thorough of its kind ever conducted. It involved detailed technical examination of the thousands of component parts recovered from the sea off Elba, and further, a tank was built in which a whole Comet aircraft was submerged, with its wings protruding through glanded apertures in the sides of the tank. The interior of the fuselage was subjected to varying hydraulic pressures to simulate the changing effects of cabin pressurization during flight, while at the same time the wings were mechanically flexed to reproduce what is technically known as "gust loading."

By this means it was possible to produce in minutes the same effects on the structure of the aircraft as would result from hours of flying, and as was to be expected, incipient structural failures were produced which very closely resembled the nature of the failure which was diagnosed from the recovered parts of the aircraft lost near Elba.

Immediately after the last war, driven by urgency, and poverty, Britain attempted to regain a place in the manufacture of civil aircraft by modifying to commercial use heavy bomber types. This policy produced such uneconomic passenger aircraft as the Lancastria and the Tudor.

While Britain had excelled in fighter design and production during the War, and had held her own in bomber design and production, the transport field had been sadly neglected.

As a result, her aircraft industry soon found itself in serious difficulty, with (a) its wartime military designs obsolescent, (b) commercial versions of bombers lacking in passenger appeal and expensive to operate, (c) her own national airlines purchasing U.S.-built aircraft which were basically modern military transports.

The British aviation industry realized that its chief competitor had a long head start, and that drastic and united action was called for. The Society of British Aircraft Constructors, membership of which includes virtually every firm in Great Britain which manufactures anything connected with aviation, conceived and implemented the idea of the Farnborough Air Display.

Since Britain maintains more aero engine manufacturing companies and many more airframe builders than the very much larger United States, competition among them is extremely keen, yet from the standpoint of the outsider at least, all these differences are submerged in the annual co-operative effort which is Farnborough. The show lasts for only five days, only three of which are open to the public, yet the annual attendance is in the order of 400,000.

Successive Farnborough Shows provide an accurate history of post-war aero engine development and give what is probably a clear indication of the future trends in engine design.

The gasoline piston engine, which for nearly half a century has been the motive power of virtually every aircraft, appears less and less frequently at Farnborough.

All the larger propeller-driven aircraft are powered with turbo-propeller engines, which as you know have points of similarity with the turbo-jet engine, but are basically different in principle.

The turbo, or full jet engine, this year, was installed in all the operational military aircraft at the Show—of course the same engine type was in the Comet Mark II and Comet Mark III.

An engine which has not yet appeared at Farnborough, but which will do so, and which in the opinion of many authorities has a major part to play in future civil aviation, is the *ducted fan,* or *by-pass* engine. One school of thought is convinced that we will not see many more new aircraft designed around piston engines, that the turbo-propeller engine will be the popular power plant in civil and military transport types designed for air speeds up to 450 m.p.h., with the by-pass engine in a wide range of types designed for air speeds between 450 and 550 m.p.h., and that commercial use of the full jet engine will be confined to aircraft of designed speeds in excess of 550 m.p.h.—a speed beyond which it will probably be uneconomical to operate except over long routes.

Again, both on the military and civil sides, the Farnborough displays in the past have, year by year, plotted the course of the development of the modern aeroplane and, because aircraft prototypes appear at Farnborough long before they are ready for regular use, the Show has proved to be an accurate barometer of future trends.

The aircraft wing is, of course, the major factor in any aircraft design. Its lift efficiency affects the load which the aircraft can carry. Its form, both in plane and in section, sets limits on the maximum speed of the aircraft, and to some extent its range, since most fuel is stored in the wing.

In five short years we have seen wing design go from the straight leading edge and comparatively thick section through moderate sweep back to the delta wing, and beyond to the extreme sweep back, and beyond that again, to the two and even three angles of sweepback.

Currently, the wing section has become thinner, and thinner, as the design speeds have increased, and the sweepback principle has extended to the leading edges of the fine and the horizontal tail surfaces.

Even with the flat and understandable refusal of the British air authorities to have the absolute last word appear at Farnborough, it has consistently been the case that what appears at Farnborough one year as a surprise prototype, is in production three or four years later.

It would not surprise me, although it would be a minor miracle, to see the Vickers 1000 in next year's Farnborough display.

That aircraft will be capable of taking off from Toronto at a reasonable hour in the morning, flying 100 passengers to London, England and bringing 100 passengers back in time for late dinner, leaving more than the required nine hours out of the twenty-four on the ground at home base for between flight inspection and maintenance.

Again in this case it seems reasonable to hope that by 1959 or 1960 a civil version of it will be available to the airlines and then it should be no more difficult or unusual to spend a weekend in London than it now is to spend one in New York.

I have talked a good deal about some technical features of the products that are to be seen at Farnborough, but setting aside its technical interest, it is a most noteworthy achievement as an institution and a spectacle.

It is even more noteworthy as a show room of a great industry and while it is quite possible that no customer ever actually bought an aircraft at Farnborough, it is quite certain that what was seen at Farnborough both by the representatives of the world's Air Forces and the world's airlines, eventually produced orders which were impressive, even in an industry where the price tag on each article may be anywhere from $700,000 to $2,000,000.

It is interesting to talk about Farnborough to British manufacturers. Each regards the date of the Farnborough Show as a deadline which he must meet if his latest product is to go on display. Each will claim that meeting that deadline has disrupted the even functioning of his organization. Yet I think none will deny that the incentive of Farnborough has played a major part in bringing the British aircraft industry in ten years, from the most unhappy position which I described at the outset of this talk, to one of world prominence.

THANKS OF THE MEETNG were expressed by Mr. Tracy Lloyd, a Past President of the Club.

“THE DEATH PENALTY-FOR AND AGAINST”

The case against the death penalty by

ARTHUR MALONEY, ESQ., Q.C.

The case for the death penalty by

JOSEPH SEDGWICK, ESQ., Q.C.

Thursday, November 25th, 1954

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: Some 275 people have been hanged in Canada in the past 25 years, for having committed murder. Has this deterred others from commiting the same crime? Should we execute murderers? Should capital punishment be abolished? These are very controversial questions which have been occupying the attention of many Canadians for some time.

A joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons commenced hearings last January in an attempt to find an answer to the above questions and others which would help decide whether Canada should abolish capital punishment. It sat until the middle of June and will resume its hearings again within the next few months.

To enable our members better to understand the problem, your Executive asked two well known and able Toronto lawyers—Mr. Arthur Maloney, Q.C., and Mr. Joseph Sedgwick, Q.C., to come and discuss both sides of this controversial topic. They very kindly consented and we appreciate it as they are both very busy men.

Mr. Arthur Maloney, Q.C., who will speak first, will present the case against the death penalty. He is National Chairman of the Committee on the Administration of Criminal Justice for the Canadian Bar Association. Born 35 years ago, he graduated from the University of Toronto in 1940, was admitted to the Bar of Ontario in 1943 and became a Queen's Counsel in January 1954.

Mr. Joseph Sedgwick, Q.C., who will speak second, will present the case for the death penalty. Born in 1898, Mr. Sedgwick was with the Canadian Infantry in World War I, was called to the Bar of Ontario in 1923 and became a K.C. in 1933. He was a solicitor in the Department of the Attorney General from 1929 to 1937, when he resumed private practice. He was a Royal Commissioner on the Royal Commission that completely revised the Canadian Criminal Code.

I will now ask Mr. Maloney to present his case . . .

MR. MALONEY: In a discussion on the question of the death penalty it is never out of place to remind your audience of one or two of the humourous stories that are sometimes told in connection with it.

One that occurred to me to tell you today is the story of the notorious gunman who finally came into the clutches of the law and was convicted of murder and sentenced to be hanged. The night of his execution arrived, a solemn procession formed outside the cell and he was led to the foot of the thirteen steps that led to the gallows. He mounted them, one by one, until he came to the thirteenth which gave way beneath him. Fortunately, he was able to grasp the railing beside him and when about inches from the trap door he turned around to the Governor and he said, "This damned thing ain't safe."

Now, before making a few comments about the question generally and the views I entertain about it, there are a few facts and figures which it might assist you to hear, because it helps you to know approximately how many and what types of persons you are talking about when you are talking about any subject, and especially when you are talking about the subject of the death penalty.

In Canada, for the twenty year period, between 1930 and 1949, 407 persons were sentenced to death. Of that number, 220 only were actually hanged. Out of that group, 88 had their sentences commuted by the Minister of Justice or, as I should say more accurately, the Governor-in-Council, to imprisonment for life, and 99 of these original 407 cases had their cases otherwise disposed of, which means by way of Appeals to Provincial Appellate Courts, or their death before the date of execution had arrived.

Now 69 per cent of the original number of 407 cases were those in which juries had recommended mercy, and of the number in which the juries had recommended mercy, their recommendation was not respected in approximately 27.6 per cent of the cases.

So, bear in mind, if ever you should form a member of a Jury panel, not only, first of all, are you entitled to recommend mercy, but secondly, according to past history, in about 27 per cent of those cases your recommendation will be disregarded.

Now, it is of interest to know the motives that lie behind the murders committed in the country in the twenty year period. Here are some of the figures:

Of the total group, wife murders make up only 8 per cent; husband murders, 1.6 per cent; parent murders, 3.2 per cent; sweetheart murders, 1.3 per cent; mistress murders, 4.8 per cent; children, .9 per cent; sex assaults, 5.5 per cent; robbery, 32.7 per cent; revenge or jealousy, 13.9 per cent; escaping custody or arrest, 1.3 per cent; policemen, 4.8 per cent; and the rest, of various categories, 22 per cent.

In the Province of Ontario, if you want to bring it closer to home, in the twenty year period in question, of the original total group of 407 I mentioned, 96 of those persons sentenced to death came from Ontario. 31 had sentences commuted with the result that 65 persons in that twenty year period were actually executed.

In Quebec during the corresponding period, 73 persons were sentenced to death. 15 had their sentences commuted, and 58 were ultimately executed.

The question of executive clemency which is a question with which I suppose most of you are familiar is one I will occasionally refer to in another connection in a moment. Executive clemency is the last final right a person convicted of murder in our country has to save himself from the gallows.

In other words, the trial is over, he is convicted, all rights of appeal are exhausted . . . there remains but one appeal left . . . that is to the Governor-General-in-Council who acts on recommendation of the Federal Cabinet which in turn acts on the recommendation made by the Solicitor-General, as a general rule.

Now, it is interesting to contrast the use made in Canada of this privilege of executive clemency with the corresponding use made in England. In 1930 to 1939, dealing with this ten year period, here is what you find by way of contrast. In England between 1930 and 1939, 156 separate sentences were reviewed by the Executive. Of those 47 per cent were commuted to imprisonment for life. In Canada between 1930 and 1939, 167 persons had their sentences reviewed by the Executive and only 25 per cent were commuted.

In England in the ten year interval between 1940 and 1949, 220 sentences of death were reviewed by the Executive and 43 per cent commuted. In Canada in the same ten year interval, 141 had sentences of death reviewed but only 32 per cent had those sentences so commuted.

Those are some figures that might assist you in determining the arguments for and against the death penalty.

The conduct of murderers who have been convicted of murder, sentenced to death and whose sentences were commuted to imprisonment for life and were released on parole after they have served a certain portion of their sentences is of some interest.

In England between 1934 and 1948, about a fifteen year period, 129 such persons were discharged from prison on parole. 112 are today reported to be doing well . . . three not heard from . . . fourteen reconvicted (only one for murder), the rest for burglary, theft, fraud, using a false name. The one convicted of a second murder is the celebrated case of Walter Howlett. The particulars of this case I shall not trouble to tell you about except to state the fact that the error involved was his release from prison in the first place, because he was a mental case.

Now the figures in Canada, certainly of the conduct of released convicted murderers whose sentences have been commuted is not as accurate. All we know is that the average of failures estimated in Canada has fluctuated around three per cent, and so far as I know, no convicted murderer who has been released or is back in custody, has committed in Canada a second murder.

Now, with those factual observations, I would like to move on very briefly to some other aspects of the problem. The question of the death penalty is one that has been disputed, as you well know, for many, many centuries. It is a subject of great controversy in Canada today, because of the appointment of the Committee to investigate the question . . . the Joint Committee of the House of Commons and of the Senate.

The case for the death penalty has always found adherents. As a matter of fact, in England in 1838 it was possible to hang a man who stole five shillings or more. Today you and I would be appalled if we ever heard of such a thing being done. Yet, actually it was seriously debated and debated for years before abolition of the death penalty for that crime. In order to persuade his fellow legislators to vote against the abolition of the death penalty for theft, the Lord Justice of England said in 1838, when he was asked to concur in a vote to abolish the death penalty for theft of five shillings or more: "My Lords, if you suffer this Bill to pass we shall not know where to stand. We shall not know whether on hands, head or feet. Repeal this law and no man can trust himself for more than an hour out of doors, lest every vestige of his property be swept away by the hardened robbers."

So I say the controversy over this subject has gone on for centuries. I must admit my opposition to the penalty of death is an instinctive one, as is the feeling in the hearts of those that would support it. I have long had an instinctive aversion to it. It was not long before I realized I could not recruit much support from my fellow man if all I could point to him was my own instinct in the matter, so I approached the question with the aim of someone who wants to find facts and figures that will support him, and it is a subject I naturally approached with some diffidence, fearful of what the results would be.

You can imagine how reassured and how confident I felt when the research that I made satisfied me, as I submit it will satisfy you, that sentiment and emotion are not, as some people feel, the only factors on the side of those who would abolish the death penalty. Sentiment and emotion are also on the side of those who would retain it, because scientific data that is being scientifically acquired states, and empirical knowledge satisfies me as I submit it will satisfy you, that the death penalty has no deterrent effect.

Now, to me there is but one basis on which the death penalty can be justified . . . that is if it proves to have a deterrent effect. I think no matter what our instincts are, no matter what our feelings in regard to it may be, if it is proved to have the effect of deterring others from committing crime we must bury our own aversions and our deep instincts and submit to the imposition of this penalty, but I submit to you that the facts reveal otherwise, and that to attempt to justify the retention of the death penalty on any other basis than its deterrent effect is inconceivable.

I can't imagine any one of you saying it is lawful to retain the death penalty on some revengeful basis. That leads to the question, does it deter?

Too often we are inclined to answer by saying "Yes." When asked why we say Yes, we say, "Because it would deter me." That is the fallacy that lies at the root of the thinking of everyone, in my submission, who favours the retention of the death penalty. You say it would deter, because it would deter you. The fact is the average murderer is a man very unlike you, a man with whom you have nothing in common . . . a man with whom you would share no interests . . . and what would deter him would not have the slightest effect on you, and what would deter you would not have the slightest effect on him. That, I submit, is one of the real fallacies in the argument of those who would retain the death penalty and the retention of the death penalty or otherwise should not be determined by that subjective test, but it should be determined instead by a cold, impersonal study of the facts as we know them.

Now, thirty-six jurisdictions throughout the world, sprawled across Europe, the United States, South America, Asia and Africa, have experimented with the abolition of the death penalty. People of all races and creeds, people of all colours, people from cold climates and people from hot climates, people from countries mainly industrial and people from countries mainly agricultural, all have experimented with abolition, thirty-six of them, and they boast of having done so because they have done so successfully.

Surely a cross section of so many countries is something with which we of Canada can make an effective comparison for the purpose of determining what we should do ourselves.

I am not going to trouble you with any further statistics. Statistics are easily available to anyone who wants to consult them. The most general available reference of most recent date is the Report of the Royal Commission on Capital Punishment in 1953. If anyone is interested in reading it you should address a letter to Her Majesty's Stationer, in London, and have a copy forwarded to you.

Just before I conclude, this is a question, as you know, which can be discussed in many aspects, under many headings. It cannot be discussed under any aspect very thoroughly in the short interval of time given to speakers at a meeting of this nature. There is one aspect, perhaps two, on which I would like very briefly to touch before I conclude.

One aspect of the death penalty that rather shocks me is the inequality of its imposition. That inequality reflects itself in a number of ways. In the vast majority of cases convicted murderers are men who are poor and in many cases . . . far too many . . . they are defended by inadequate legal help.

I have in mind the case of four convicted murderers who were defended by a lawyer about whose sanity we all entertained doubts. This lawyer is now dead and it makes it less embarrassing to discuss the case. In 1950 in a case tried before the late Hon. Mr. Justice Green, the wife of this lawyer brought an action to have her marriage annulled on the grounds that at the time it was solemnized her husband was insane and in the judgment given by the late Mr. Justice Green, he says in his formal judgment the marriage should be declared null and void on the grounds the man was at the time of celebration of the form of marriage incapable of contracting the said marriage by reason of his mental incapacity.

The date of the marriage was March 5, 1946. In September 1946 he defended a convicted murderer. On February 8th, 1947, he defended a convicted murderer. On March 4th, 1947, he defended a convicted murderer. At a later date, I do not have the exact date, in 1947, he defended a convicted murderer. Every one was sentenced to death, and in December 1948 he was committed to a mental institution.

Those are hard things to say but they must be said. They demonstrate the inequality of the imposition of the death penalty.

Apart all together from that, a defence of the convicted murderer too often involves the first experience in the courtroom for a young lawyer, just out of law school.

That is one aspect of the inequality. Another aspect of the inequality is the difference in the vigour with which the prosecution is conducted, the difference in the fairness with which a prosecution is conducted, and with which police investigation is conducted. Contrast on the one hand, the celebrated case of Mrs. Bell, the fairness with which that prosecution was conducted by Counsel for the Crown . . . not a single detail was held from the Defence . . . there was an exhaustive preliminary hearing before the trial . . . not a single thing was done of which anyone could be critical. No matter what the outcome of that case she never could have complained about a lack of fairness on the part of the prosecution . . . Contrast that with another case which I am not at liberty to name, but with which I had personal experience, in which the very opposite occurred . . . deliberate efforts to conceal facts from the Defence, deliberate efforts to take the Defence by surprise.

So there is another aspect in which there is an inequality about the imposition of the penalty of death.

Then, too, to a lesser degree, not inequality, but the difference in men . . . the difference in trial judges. They are human . . . they have a difference in temperament . . . a difference in outlook. Some have an aversion to the death penalty, some are opposed to it, some are in favour of it. It is not disrespectful of a Judge to say that your chances, if you are defending a man charged with murder, are likely to be more successful if tried before Judge A, rather than Judge B. This is another aspect of the inequality.

Take too, the difference in locale. Urban juries are invariably more adverse to the death penalty than are rural juries.

I have in mind a case, not too long ago, of a young man in the Province of Quebec, convicted of a murder of another young man as a result of a jealous quarrel over the affections of a young lady. I suggest to you if that case had been tried before a Toronto jury and the same facts brought forward, I suggest that man would now be serving a sentence for manslaughter.

There is an inequality throughout the country in the chances of acquittal for murder and conviction for manslaughter.

Now, I am reminded when I talk about that of an incident that again arose in connection with the trial of Mrs. Bell. You recall one juryman there expressed aversion to the death penalty. I hope no one misunderstood what was done there. The exception taken to his conduct was not for having opposition to the death penalty but for refusing to be sworn. It was refusing to be sworn that was held to be improper by the Trial Judge, not his views of opposition to the penalty of death. Those are not views of which anyone need be ashamed.

In conclusion, not having by any means exhausted the subject, as I sometimes wish I had an opportunity to do, although it would take too long a time to do, I submit a fair study of all the facts will satisfy you that the death penalty has no proved deterrent effect, that in its application it is unequal, and that in this country, civilized as we boast of being, it should be done away with and should be done away with now.

PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr. Maloney. I will now call on Mr. Joseph Sedgwick, Q.C., to present the case for the death penalty.

MR. SEDGWICK: It is never easy to follow Mr. Maloney, and it is particularly difficult to do so when one is dealing with this subject which he has made so peculiarly his own. Indeed, I sometimes think the present interest in the abolition of the death penalty as being largely attributable to the effort that Mr. Arthur Maloney has put forth and I have on occasion described it as the Maloney Crusade.

What Mr. Maloney said in his opening is quite true . . . it is difficult to approach the subject with any degree of logic. In fact, in what may well be called the classic plea for the abolition of Capital Punishment, Lord Templewood's "The Shadow of the Gallows", that humane and experienced gentlemen, who was for some years Home

Secretary in England, makes it clear that most people who have any decided views on the subject have those views more by instinct than by logical process.

Mr. Maloney quoted to you some statistics and there are many statistics showing the incidence of capital crime in those countries that have abolished the death penalty as compared with those that have not done so. Really and truly, they prove nothing. As Mr. Quentin Hogg said in the debate on the matter in the British House . . . and it was a most helpful debate . . . he said, "Statistics are not cogent . . . patiently, honourably and scrupulously collected as they have been, they only befuddle us." He went on to say that he preferred to look into his own heart, and there he found that if he were a professional burglar, with terms of penal servitude behind him and no death penalty to fear, he would take the chance of carrying a gun and shooting any witness of his crime. He added that against the result of this heart searching, "neither Dr. Jung nor the statistics will convince me to the contrary."

But one does get a little help, if not from statistics, at least from the experience of other civilizations similar to our own. One finds, for instance, that New Zealand did abolish the death penalty, tacitly, by not enforcing it, from 1936 to 1941, and specifically by legislation from 1941 to 1950. Then in 1950, and I believe as a result of two atrocious murders that shocked the public conscience, the death penalty was restored in that Commonwealth whose people are greatly similar to our own.

To argue that there were more murders during the period when the death penalty was enforced than during a similar period when it was not is to make no argument at all. Murder is not a crime susceptible to mathematical measurement, by which I mean that the factors are not constant . . . the times, the economics, many things are to be considered . . . and while of course it is possible to say actuarially that so many people will die in a given decade, it is not and never has been possible to say that so many people will be murdered.

This is not the first time I have taken this side of the question. I have debated it before with Mr. Maloney and I debated it very recently with a most eminent member of our Canadian Bar, a specialist in criminal cases, Mr. G. Arthur Martin, and I recall in the course of his talk , . . he took the side Mr. Maloney takes . . . he said "I must be frank to say that no conclusive case either in favour of the retention of capital punishment or in favour of its abolition can be based only on statistics. The incidence of crime in a given place at a given time depends on many factors, the principal one being the economic and cultural level the community has attained."

Apart from the statistical argument, which is almost always used by the advocates of abolition, there is the other argument that Mr. Maloney stressed . . . that is the awful finality of it. That is true. One cannot call back from "the unanswering legion of the dead". But it is also true that the risk of judicial miscarriage on that level of crime is so slight as to be negligible, and no proponent of abolition can cite a case within the last fifty years at least of a person hanged and later proved, or reasonably suspected to be, innocent. There are so many safeguards existing now that did not exist at the start of this century.

I was interested in Mr. Maloney's story of the mad lawyer and I think I have in mind the deceased gentleman to whom he has reference. All I can say about that, lawyers do not after all try cases . . . they merely present them and even though a man may be in some respects quite mad, he may be in other respects sane and I think in respect of being an advocate, completely competent, and the mere fact he defended successively a number of people charged with murder would at least indicate those unfortunate persons had considerable confidence in his ability.

However, apart from the advocate, and there is no level of advocacy . . . no level at all . . . you can't say of one man he is superbly competent and another incompetent. Apart from that there are so many safeguards and, as Mr. Maloney told you, we now have a Court of

Criminal Appeal and I think I am safe in saying no person ever convicted of murder fails to appeal. In every case he does appeal his case is reviewed with the utmost care by a bench, in this Province at least, of five judges. Then, if there is still doubt, by right in certain cases, and by leave in others, the case may be carried to the Supreme Court of Canada, where there will be an equally careful and exhaustive inquiry, by a bench consisting of nine judges, and there the matter is again canvassed with the greatest of care, and I feel confident, in my mind at least, that if there is any reasonable doubt whatsoever that doubt is resolved in favour of the accused person, even at the Appelate level.

And finally, and Mr. Maloney referred to this also, there is complete review of the matter by the Department of Justice, and there is a right exercised . . . I think Mr. Maloney said . . . in something like twenty-six per cent of the cases to reprieve the convicted person, even at the last moment, after all appeals have been heard and dismissed.

I can only say in my own experience at the Bar for almost a third of a century, during which time I have appeared both for the Crown and the accused, and in a number of murder cases, I cannot think of a case where the capital penalty was inflicted and there remained even a scintilla of doubt as to the guilt of the culprit.

Then another argument that Mr. Maloney did not touch on, but that I have heard many refer to, is that hanging is a brutal thing. I have never witnessed a hanging and have not the slightest intention of so doing, therefore I can have no very convincing opinion. You will hear that argument advanced and I can only tell you it is said by those most competent to judge that it is quick and painless extinction.

In England some years ago the Home Office made a careful study of the matter, and issued a somewhat macabre but interesting report which concludes, "there is no record during the present century of any failure or mishap in connection with an execution, and as now carried out execution by hanging can be regarded as speedy and certain."

I have, of course, read of hangings, I have read of electrocutions, I have read of guilottinings, and also of the methods practised in some of the States of the Union, where I think they are killed by cyanide pottasium or something of that sort, and I can only say one seems about as humane as the other, and in any event the method of execution is hardly pertinent to a discussion of whether you have executions or not. It should be no part of the argument to discuss how they should be carried out.

Of course it should be argued that the extreme privacy that surrounds executions today adds to their horror, rather than taking away from it, and we might consider the advisability of going back to public executions. I am not to be taken as saying I favour that course, but there is quite an argument to be made for it, and those who still read that great literary pundit of the 19th century, Dr. Samuel Johnson, may recall that he defended public hangings with some vigour, as being in the public interest. He said, "They object that the old method drew together a number of spectators. Sir, executions are intended to draw spectators. If they do not draw spectators, they don't answer their purpose. The old method was most satisfactory to all parties; the public was gratified by a procession; the criminal was supported by it. Why is all this to be swept away?"

May I say a word about the economics of the whole matter. In this we are all interested, as taxpayers. If murderers are not to be executed, what then is to be done with them? The only alternative I have ever heard suggested is that they should be imprisoned, some say for life, some say for a period long enough to ensure reform. Mr. Maloney, with his customary honesty, suggested to you that one man who was committed for murder and was reformed, went out and committed murder a second time, which is an argument hardly in favour of releasing people convicted of a crime. If a murderer is to be incarcerated for the whole of his life, is that lingering death a more humane thing than the speedy execution of the gallows? What hope is there for such a man who knows he must drag out his days, whether twenty, thirty, forty or fifty years, within the stone walls of the penal institution? Or, if after a period of imprisonment he is to be released . . . and I believe in States where they do release people after they have been convicted of murder, the average time served is sixteen years—there are statistics about that, too . . . if he is to be released after fifteen or sixteen or twenty years, what assurance has society of his reformation? Can we be sure in a critical moment he will not again turn to the gun or the knife?

Again, to take the extreme case, and that is the case of the lifer who is confined in a penal institution, and who knows he will never be released by process of law, why should he not kill to get out? Why should he not kill a warden or guard, or make his escape if he can, knowing nothing will be done except that he will be put back in prison if caught? And supposing such a one does make good his escape, why should he, when at liberty, scruple to kill again, for protection from recapture, for gain, or for mere caprice, as he has nothing whatsoever to lose.

While certainly I do not want to propose to weigh human life against money, why should society pay, year after year, to keep such a person in confinement when we know there is not the slightest possibility that he will ever make any return to society, any contribution to society in return for his keep.

I do not kow the accurate cost of keeping a prisoner in an institution such as Kingston. My guess would be that it would be about $2000 a year, presuming we kept a man there for forty years, society will spend some $80,000 for a completely useless individual, useless at least in so far as any contribution he may make to society is concerned. All I can say is it is too much to pay for too little.

As Mr. Justice Keiller Mackay said, when discussing the same subject not long ago, and I must completely agree with him, "Is it not time that the state should begin by asking, not necessarily what is good for the murderer but, on the other hand, what is necessary for the good order of society and the preservation of the lives and safety of its citizens?" Or, as an eminent judge said many years ago, he had always believed if you hanged a man when he was young he would not bother you when he was old.

Finally, coming back to my starting injunction, I ask you to search your own hearts. Don't be convinced by rhetoric . . . either Mr. Maloney's or mine . . . or by statistics, which at best are a very dull guide, but decide what each of us, as individuals, would do if murder came home to you and your family. Consider, for instance the specific case, the case of a man called O'Donnell, who was hanged in Toronto not many years ago. A sex degenerate, he had been convicted on more than one occasion of crimes against young girls. Finally, he raped and murdered a young girl and he was convicted and executed. Suppose that girl had been your daughter or mine, what punishment do you think would have been fitting for the murderer?

Consider the case of Seddon, the poisoner . . . another case in all the books on crime . . . the man who deliberately planned the murder, the painful death of a woman who trusted him and who had made over her few pitiful savings to him in return for an annuity, and he poisoned her so by shortening her life he would not have any long time to have to pay the annuity he had traded for her savings. Do you think that such a mean monster as that should be kept alive at the public expense for fifteen or twenty years, and then should be released, again to plot murder, if he so saw fit, and with no punishment to fear except being returned to prison?

Mr. Maloney says that the death penalty, that the gallows has no deterrent effect. I can only echo what Mr. Quinton Hogg said, "I think it would deter me" and when Mr. Maloney says murderers are not, generally speaking, of the class to which you gentlemen here are privileged to belong, certainly he is overlooking the case of Seddon who belonged to what is called the middle or upper class.

One could multiply examples. I have neither time nor inclination. Indeed, referring to a case that Mr. Maloney defended with ability, the case of Suchan and Jackson, who were tried for what I thought the unprovoked murder of a gallant and unarmed officer, Detective Sergeant Edward Tong, they were hanged, and I think rightly hanged. I think society owes a duty to protect itself. I think society owes a duty to its police, and I think the police are entitled to feel that taking, as they do, their lives in their hands, if one is killed by people bent on crime, that condign punishment will be visited on the murderer.

And lastly, I am not sure that I favour the compulsory death penalty. Mr. Maloney pointed out to you that juries have a right or privilege, whichever you may describe it as, of recommending mercy and that in a large percentage of the cases where there is such a recommendation, the Department gives weight to it, but certainly not in all.

In some States of the Union to the south of us, and in some other jurisdictions, the jury have a final duty to decide on the penalty. They can bring in a verdict of murder in the first degree which is followed by the compulsory imposition of the death penalty or maybe some lesser degree of murder, in which case only a term of imprisonment is imposed or, in some cases, the jury may specifically recommend mercy and the Judge is bound to accede to the recommendation. I am not sure I wouldn't favour such a course. I think it may be the twelve men of the jury should have the right to say whether the convicted person is to be hanged or imprisoned.

With that limitation, I strongly favour retaining the death penalty for those cases of murder most foul.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by the Honourable J. W. Pickup, Chief Justice of Ontario.

"THE SCOTTISH SCENE"

An Address by

THE EARL OF WEMYSS AND MARCH
Chairman of Council, National Trust for Scotland

Thursday, December 2nd, 1954

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: It is a great pleasure—and most appropriate following St. Andrew's Day—to welcome as the speaker to this meeting The Right Honourable The Earl of Wemyss and March, LL.D., Chairman of the Council of the National Trust for Scotland.

Born in 1912, the son of the late Lord Elcho who was killed in action in 1916, Lord Wemyss was educated at Eton and at Balliol College, Oxford. His great grandfather founded the London Scottish Rifle Volunteers, which is affiliated with the Toronto Scottish. Later he studied Agricultural Law and factoring in the estate offices of his immediate predecessor and first Chairman of the Trust, the late Sir Iain Colquhoun of Luss.

In 1937 Lord Wemyss was appointed Assistant District Commissioner in Basutoland. His military experience gained earlier as a territorial soldier with the Lovat Scouts stood him in good stead three years later when he joined the Basutoland Pioneer Troops, and served with them in the Middle East, including a period with the Eighth Army and Staff appointments at G.H.Q. Middle East and Tripoli.

With the administration of his estates in East Lothian, Peebleshire, Selkirkshire and Gloucestershire, he combines a great deal of hard work in the cause of Scotland and her ancient traditions. In addition to heading the Council of the Trust, he also acts as Chairman of the Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions of Scotland, and as Chairman of the Marie Curie Memorial Foundation in Scotland.

Lord Wemyss' full style and title is "12th Earl of Wemyss and March, Viscount Peebles, Lord Elcho and Methil, Baron Douglas of Neidpath, Lyne and Munard, Baron Wemyss.

He will speak to us on "The Scottish Scene".

LORD WEMYSS: It is a great honour that you should have asked me to come and speak to you at your luncheon today and I esteem that, because my wife and my Secretary and I came to Canada, mainly to speak to the people of Scottish interests and affiliations, and as this Club of yours has not a Scottish label, perhaps an excuse is needed for me coming to speak to this Club. Possibly St. Andrew's Day may form that excuse or part of it. Possibly also it would be admitted that the Empire Club had something to do with the linkup between the nations of the British Commonwealth in which the Scottish people have not been entirely unconcerned. Indeed, the Scottish people have heard about quite a lot of other countries in the Commonwealth and most other countries in the Commonwealth seem to have heard about them. It wasn't always so.

I remember hearing an old Minister in the Highlands who even thought that the Almighty had to be appraised of the existence of England, because in his prayers every Sunday he first of all prayed for Queen Victoria and her Ministers, and all her people . . . then he would go on to say, We pray Thee also, Oh Lord, for the happiness and prosperity of the neighbouring country of England which lies, as Thou knowest, Oh Lord, some three hundred miles to the south of us.

Well, I think our horizons have widened a bit since then and in some ways at least among some of us, our sense of obligation has widened too, and that is the body in particular which I have the honour to be the Chairman of, which is called the National Trust for Scotland, and which has undertaken the obligation of preserving in Scotland as much as possible of our national heritage; our national heritage in the shape of old and interesting buildings, and beautiful countryside, and that is the particular aspect of the Scottish scene with which I am concerned and about which I am going to ask leave to speak to you briefly today.

The National Trust for Scotland, which is concerned with the preservation of this important part of the Scottish scene is in a sense concerned with the past, for obvious reasons, and yet it is vitally concerned with the present, because our special aim is to try to bring alive, or keep alive all that is good and worthy in our past, or at least in the physical, tangible aspects of our past, for purposes up to date and relevant to the needs of this movement.

We are preserving as much as we can, not as picturesque ruins, not even as interesting museums, but preserving things in a living form. The most obvious example is that a property which was built as a house, should if it is possible continue to be used as a dwelling house, and that is our aim which we achieve entirely by the support of our members. Because, strange as it seems, with this title, "The National Trust for Scotland" and strange though it may seem to some people for other reasons, it is not the government nor any branch of the government, nor department of the government which is undertaking this vital job. On the contrary, it is a private organization and a charity of which any person, any individual or any Club or City Council, County Council or organization of any kind can be and is welcome to be a member, a subscribing member.

We are approaching seven thousand members now and although they are mostly in Scotland itself, we have a large number outside, and the fee for membership which we are proud to say has never increased since the Trust was founded in 1931, although most other things have doubled or trebled in those twenty-three years, the fee is still ten shillings for individual members . . . approximately $1.50 . . . and we are proud that it has been kept so low.

In addition to the strong support of our membership which we look upon as enlightened public support, we are proud also to number many worthy men and women of substantial position in the country, of great brains and intelligence, and busy people, too, who in spite of being so busy are willing to put aside a considerable portion of their time to work for the objects of the Trust, voluntarily, and gratuitously, either as members of our Council which is the central directing body, about thirty or thirty-two strong, that meets two or three times a year, or as members of the various committees that run the Trust.

With this public support and with this fine membership of Council and committees we flatter ourselves that we are in a strong, independent position, and we are not tied up with any particular party, any religious party or local affiliation of any kind, so in the case of a controversy about the preservation or the destruction, for example, of a building whether a house or a church or a castle or some wee cottage or anything at all, we can take an objective view, and try and speak out if we think it necessary to speak out, from the national point of view, not any local or sectional point of view.

We are trying to preserve such things as I have mentioned and I will give you just a few examples, either by becoming the owners of the property . . . that is what I call direct preservation . . . or else what is even more important, indirect preservation, by setting an example and setting a fashion for other people, whether the other people be the owners of such property or whether they be the local authorities, the Councils and corporations or government departments that have influence and maybe have funds which they can use in the right way to lend their weight and their influence on the side of historic preservation or the maintenance unspoiled of our beautiful countryside.

But in order to set an example in this fashion, we have, as I mentioned just now, got to do something about it directly ourselves, and up to date in our twenty-three years we have acquired something like sixty properties. They are nearly all over Scotland. They are various in type, very different in age. The oldest of them, which is the circle of Druid Stones of Clava, dates from about 2000 B.C. and the newest which is an example of the work of Sir Robert Lorimer, the Scottish architect, dates from only 1905 or 1910. In between we have many different types of property.

The type of the moment which is causing us the greatest concern, because it is apt to disappear almost over night, is the small house architecture of a characteristic Scottish style, most of which dates from the early 18th or the 17th centuries and we don't think, as many people do, that an old cottage, stuck away somewhere, neglected and falling down, is just an old cottage. If it has, as so many of them do, some form of architectural interest or dates from a period from which we haven't very many examples preserved, we try and lend our weight when called upon and when able, to maintaining these places, and not allowing them to be swept away just as so much stone and mortar. It is all too apt to happen. Progress and development in these last fifty years has been rapid, indeed. Change has come . . . industrialization . . . new roads, new everything. There is literally not time often for people to sit back and think now on what ought to be kept of our past in the redevelopment of this town, this village or that.

Without something such as the Trust it does happen, and has happened regretfully often, that everything of interest in a town is swept away. Where we can get in and do a job, or persuade others to do it, we try and work on the principle of preserving the exterior, the attractive features of the exterior and doing up the interior with all modern conveniences for an up to date family to live in it. Our tenants who live in these old houses are very content and not only that, but in every case I think they are proud to be in such an interesting house, a house which draws the eyes of all passers by, and enhances and will continue to enhance the attractions and the interest, and the tourist potential, and the trade potential, too, into the bargain, of whatever village or town it is in.

Some of the attractive features we particularly look for are the delightful red tiled roofs and the projecting gables. Those of you who have not visited Scotland have probably seen them in pictures. There are too few left, probably seen them in pictures. There are too few left, and it is all the more reason to hang on to what we have got.

We have had a good many controversies in the past about this type of house. For example, we have a house in Edinburgh which many years ago was going to be pulled down because it was, it is true, a verminous and derelict slum. Admitting that, we nevertheless said it ought to be restored and kept as a house and not just pulled down and something else built new from the ground up. Through the generosity of a local Edinburgh lady we were able to do this and we were more right than we knew. We knew it was an interesting building . . . we didn't know how interesting. We knew nothing at that time of the internal decorations, the painted walls and ceilings, hidden under plaster, and centuries of dirt. We knew nothing of some of the attractive features of the outside, hidden behind a shoddy shop front. All those things have since been exposed and there is the house standing today, one of the principal ornaments of the Royal Mile of Edinburgh, called Gladstone's Land . . . eight stories high, one of the original skyscrapers, built long before they thought of that in New York.

In more recent years we saved the oldest house in Aberdeen, called Provost Ross's House. He lived in 1710, in the days of Queen Anne. One of our Inland Revenue officers, one of the taxation boys, after we acquired the property, rang up the office and told us he would be terribly glad if we would tell him if Provost Ross was still occupying his house. He wasn't, of course, but the interest still remains, and with the support, which could only be won after a long debate, of the Aberdeen City Council and of many generous contributors, we have now restored this house which was literally tottering to its ruin. We found there again, more interest than we knew, we found a date stone, 1592, stuck away in the fireplace. And there it stands now, one of the principal ornaments of that great city.

I could go on endlessly about old houses, but I had better go to something else. Before I do so, I would like to say that our latest "little house" project is in the central portion of the town of Dunkeld, in the Perthshire Highlands, which was all built at one time around about 1700 for the very good reason that it had all been burned down at one time, just after the battle of Killiecrankie. Well, it was all built up after this fire and stands there today as a perfect little group of planned homes, an open square with attractive little houses around it, leading into a narrow street, Cathedral Street, at the far end of which you see the greatest window of the medieval Gothic cathedral . . . beautiful, attractive and interesting, all three, but very derelict, owing to many years of uneconomic rents, and one must confess, of apathy, it had fallen sadly into decay.

Here again a certain amount of controversy had to be gone through but at the end of the day we have acquired some of these houses and we are taking them in hand and restoring them as modern living accommodation which will be as good as you can get and moreover, will be attractive and interesting as well. And here is another point which is sometimes lost sight of . . . it will be in the middle of the town, close to the shops and everything else, instead of miles away in the suburbs.

We have much need also to keep an eye on the beautiful country, the beauty spots if you like of Scotland. The Scots are a romantically minded race, and very often they sing the glories of the bonny banks and glens, and all that, but they are a practical race, too, and are just as apt as any other race or country to shove up a filling station or a shack or a bungalow of some description where they think they are going to catch the tourist or the passerby. This might happen and has happened in such a way as to mar the scenery of some attractive place. So we have stepped in in a few instances to prevent this happening. Invariably with public support in the locality, we have taken over some of these places and such desecrations, as long as we are in possession will never happen now. Among others, some of these spots are battlefields. They are not necessarily picturesque, and the earliest of the battlefields which I am going to mention briefly is nothing but three ploughed fields now on the outskirts of Stirling, but it has a name which stirs any Scottish heart and I think our English friends have heard also the name of Bannockburn . . . or am I mistaken perhaps?

Well, Bannockburn is where we won that freedom in 1314, and Bannockburn was where the local Town Council was going to build a new housing scheme in 1920 something. So a National Committee had a fund raised to stop that happening, as a result of which we, the Trust, were asked to take over and are now the owners of these three fields which the historians say include within their limits the essential crisis areas of that successful battle.

I mentioned Killiecrankie a minute ago. That was a battle in 1689 where the Highlanders defeated the army of William III, and the Earl of Claverhouse was killed with a silver bullet. It is a picturesque place, too, and we have that in safe keeping and are there to prevent any filling stations or undesirable development spoiling the scene.

The Glenfinnan Monument stands where Prince Charles raised his standard at the beginning of the Rising . . . August 19th, 1745, to be exact . . . in the West Highlands. It is a picturesque place.

And, lastly, the Battlefield of Culloden, where the Highland Clans went down fighting before the army of the Duke of Cumberland. There—it is a more accessible place than Glenfinnan or Killiecrankie—the Trust has stepped in, in some respects too late. Before we came on the scene . . . before, indeed, we were invited . . . some of these filling stations that I have mentioned had been built and what is even worse the public road had been allowed to run through what is literally a sacred cemetery where the Highland Clans lie buried in their common graves. Buses and motor cars were all too apt to turn off the road and run on top of the graves. This has been prevented in some degree but this just emphasizes my point that some national body has got to look after these sites and has got to be publicly supported in doing so to prevent this sort of thing ever happening again.

We have several large areas of high ranging country in our ownership and keeping, and I think I told you that we were most concerned of all with the little houses, because they are apt to fall down over night. We are concerned with all houses because if they are not kept in repair they are apt to fall down sooner or later, but why, you might ask, should we be concerned with the ancestral hills which do not generally fall down . . . not within millions of years. The answer is because we feel the necessity, and there is a public demand for wide open spaces where people, to their hearts' content, can climb and walk and enjoy themselves without hindrance from sporting interests or any other type of opposing idea.

We have no political plank against private ownership or sporting interests . . . quite the contrary. Many of our keenest supporters are private landowners, but we are aware that especially in the shooting season there is difficulty over members of the public enjoying themselves property of the National Trust for Scotland there is no upon the high places of the country. At least on the doubt at all as to whether you may visit and enjoy the place or whether you may not . . . the answer is you may whenever you like.

There may be some additional reasons. We have some interesting botanical specimens on the top of Ben Lawers. We have historical reasons for looking after the scenery around Glencoe because of the Massacre that took place there in 1692, but the wide open space is the main reason we have for acquiring some of this mountain country; through the generosity, mostly, of one of our supporters, a man who was the lover of the high places himself and believed that others should be given the same privileges. Among others who enjoy these privileges are the hardy skiers and winter sports addicts in the winter time. We encourage them as much as we can. We have little in the way of tourist hotels to cater to such people in Scotland . . . all the more reason to give the land for them to enjoy themselves upon it.

Finally, there is one whole chapter of our work which needs something to be said about it alone, and that is the problem which confronts us in Scotland, as it does in England too, of the big country houses and gardens. Some of our country houses are of great architectural and historical interest. Some of our gardens are of outstanding beauty and scientific interest as well. But in these modern times, with the crushing load of taxation and the even more crushing load of death duties, because that strikes at a time that cannot be foreseen, it is becoming difficult, and it has in many cases become impossible for the owners to maintain these places in the manner in which they should be kept. That is why we have worked out what we call our country house scheme, and when I say "house" you must understand me to include house and garden. We are able if two or three important conditions are fulfilled, to take over a country house and garden as owner, and maintain it for all time.

The first condition and the most difficult that must be fulfilled is that somebody has got to produce the money. We have got to guarantee to do it for all time, and therefore in budgeting we have got to play safe.

The second condition is that the house or garden really must be of national importance . . . architectural, historic, or otherwise.

If those two qualifications can be fulfilled, and if the owner is willing and interested, we will take over the place; and the most important point, we will wish and encourage the owner who hands over his property to go on living there as long as he wishes, as long as he lives, and his sons, his descendants or other heirs, for all time after him.

After all, one of the most interesting things about a property or a house is the long family connection which in many cases it holds.

Just to give you a concrete example of that point, and of all the other points which are important in our country house scheme, I am going to tell briefly the history of one . . . the lands of Leys, whereon is Crathes Castle, about sixteen miles west of Aberdeen in the valley of Deeside. In 1323 these lands were granted by King Robert the Bruce, to a certain Burnett, one of his supporters. The family of Burnett and his direct descendants have been the occupants of that land and I can show you today the ancient Charter of King Robert the Bruce, and the ancient horn of tenure . . . the horn hanging in the Great Hall which is the symbol of tenancy-in-chief, or chief ownership from the Crown. From that day, unbroken to this day, they have been in occupation of that land.

Secondly, in the late 16th century, they built Crathes Castle, desiring to have a more commodious home than the one they had previously enjoyed on a defensive little island in the marsh. They built Crathes Castle in the most up to date and modern way in 1590-something. It has a wonderful sheer wall, just like the defensive walls the nobility and gentry had been building up and down Scotland for the last 250 years, and on which there was in the early days a defensive parapet on top, from which the occupants could pour down abuse, stones, boiling oil, or whatever the house provided, arrows and musket bullets, on unfriendly neighbours who tried to get in below.

Below the parapet there is nothing much but small windows and somewhere a small entrance door. That is exactly what the family of Burnett of Leys had, but in order to have a spacious and gracious building or house, they brought up the wall to a certain point, using corbelled granite, granite being the local stone. On top instead of the defensive parapet you find a fascinating cluster of towers, round towers, square towers, each having spacious rooms, wherein the modern landowner of 1596 could sit and enjoy the amenities of life.

The internal decorations are interesting in the Castle of Crathes, too, and another good reason for wishing to preserve the place. The painted ceilings here are the finest in Great Britain, painted in natural earth colours, what is called tempera, and hidden for many years by later plaster ceilings.

To carry on the story, in the reign of Queen Anne, a new wing was built on the Castle. Even in those days there was no finishing of development . . . the house has been an organic whole from the beginning up to now. An attractive new wing was added in the reign of Queen Anne and another in the reign of Queen Victoria, which makes the present house.

And again, beginning in Queen Anne's reign, the wonderful garden which surrounds Crathes Castle with magnificently clipped yew hedges, and shrubs which will grow practically nowhere else, and colourful gardens and borders are there, and are admitted by most people to be one of the finest gardens in the country today, and are looked after as the pride of her heart by the lady who represents this ancient family which has been there since 1323 and we hope will be there as long as time lasts. She lives there . . . she is protected and her family after her are protected from the load of taxation which would undoubtedly crush them in time. The public has admission . . . members of the Trust are admitted free . . . by a small payment two or three days a week.

That is how in the Castle of Crathes we are fulfilling our mandate to preserve something for the benefit of the nation.

I mustn't go on forever, Mr. President, but before I finish I just want to mention two others, very briefly, or three others of our country house properties.

We have an actual Royal Palace called Falkland Palace, where the hereditary keeper has made us his deputy keeper and given us the responsibility, with a fund behind us, of maintaining this royal palace for all time. Falkland

Palace is where in 1402 David Stuart Duke of Rothesay was starved to death, as you can read in Scott's novel, "The Fair Maid of Perth". It is the place where James V died and the place where a certain Stuart Princess was born at the end of the 16th century who has a Canadian connection. She was Princess Elizabeth Stuart, elder sister of Charles I, and she became later the Queen of Bohemia, known to history as the Winter Queen, or the Queen of Hearts, and one of her sons was that gallant cavalry leader, Prince Rupert of the Rhine, the first Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company which in Scotland claims to be practically the founders of Canada.

Some of you may have heard of Culzean Castle which stands on the coast of Ayrshire, and where after the last war we were proud to offer to General Eisenhower an apartment for his life. That is why the President of the United States is our honorary tenant on the floor of Culzean Castle and why I felt myself obliged, as well as delighted, to ask permission to call upon him the other day when in Washington, D.C., not to collect the rent, because he doesn't pay any, but merely to convey the good wishes of the Trust, and the hope that if and when his present duties permitted, he would pay us another visit, a third visit.

I mentioned gardens. We have a garden called Inverewe on the far northwest coast of Scotland . . . the same latitude as the north of Labrador, yet owing to our gulf stream which makes such a mild climate at sea level, it is possible, provided shelter can be made, and it has been made, to grow some wonderful plants here that even in the south of England you will not find growing in the open air. Inverewe is where Osgood Mackenzie started his garden, something like ninety years ago. If any of you can get hold of a book called "A Hundred Years in the Highlands" you can read all about this garden, and it is exceedingly interesting folklore and history of the northwest Highlands of Scotland.

All these properties I have mentioned, and many others I have not mentioned, without the National Trust for

Scotland would either have disappeared already or would now be in many cases on the road to dissolution. So I do ask you to agree that it is desirable and necessary that something should be done, that somebody should do this work, and we are the people of the body of private people whose membership is open to all. It is not a government department, although the Government helps in various ways. We are the people who are trying to do for Scotland this vital work, but when I say for Scotland, I don't mean that in any narrow sense. We preserve or try to preserve for the benefit of the nation, and the nation of all Scotland, and Scotland has extended her people far and wide . . . the nation is not those few million only who live north of England, it is a far wider family than that and we welcome and we commend ourselves to the support of all our friends, even if they have no Scottish blood in their veins whatever, in England and overseas and, above all, in the great countries of the British Commonwealth, in which our little nation has done so much.

That is the work we are doing, and that is the wide family we are seeking to help, by preserving for them, those of them who live today, and those who will form the generations of the future, something at least of our national heritage.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. H. T. Jamieson.

"THE UNITED STATES AND CO-EXISTENCE"

An Address by

HONOURABLE ALASTAIR BUCHAN

Washington Correspondent, "The Observer"

Thursday, December 9th, 1954

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: Within the space of less than 15 years the United States has emerged from isolationism to assume the responsibilities and many of the obligations of world leadership. This position was not sought after, but rather was thrust on that nation by world circumstances.

Just how well the United States has met its responsibilities—despite the isolationist sentiment of many of its people—is a matter of record.

Just how vital the continued acceptance of these responsibilities is for the British Commonwealth and the other free nations of the world will be discussed by our speaker today, the Honourable Alastair Buchan.

Third son of the late Lord Tweedsmuir, who was a most distinguished and beloved Governor-General of Canada and Honorary President of this Club from 1935 to 1940, the Honourable Alastair Buchan was born in England in 1918. He was educated at Eton and Oxford, came to Canada in his late teens and later completed his education at the University of Virginia in the United States.

For six years, from 1939 to 1945, he served in the Canadian Armoured Corps in England and North-West Europe.

From 1948 to 1951 the Honourable Mr. Buchan was assistant Editor of the Economist and since then he has been Washington correspondent of "The Observer" of London.

Those of us who had the pleasure of hearing him speak to this Club in March 1952 on "Washington Through British Eyes" know just how eminently qualified he is to tell us today about "The United States and Co-Existence".

MR. BUCHAN: It gives me the very greatest pleasure to be back with you again, and I am most grateful for your kind invitation. I have so little belief in my drawing powers as a public speaker that I am thrilled beyond measure when I am asked to inflict my views for a second time on a body such as yourselves who have already been through that painful and halting performance once. But I have other reasons for gratitude to you besides mere native conceit. I have so many ties with Canada that I welcome every opportunity to come up here, and most particularly to Toronto which — whatever uncharitable remarks your sister Canadian cities may make about you— remains very firmly my own favourite.

What I would like to offer you today is not a speech but something more in the nature of a journalist's report. Since I have the great good fortune to speak only for myself, I would like to put forward what is a personal interpretation of the trend of American policy. I know it is an unwise thing to do. Though it is nearly twenty years since I first visited the United States, I know that my knowledge of the country, my intuitive and inherited feeling for the country, is not nearly as great as yours, and that for an Englishman, or even a Scotsman to talk about the United States to Canadians is a rash thing to do. Nevertheless with your indulgence I will stick my neck out the length of a giraffe's.

In the two and a half years since I last had the priviledge of talking to you, the world scene has assumed a very different pattern. By comparison, the problem then seemed a simple one: the principal job on hand was to win the war in Korea, to build up the strength of the NATO forces in Europe, and to push our rearmament programmes as far as was consistent with sound economic policy. Since then so much has happened and so fast that it is hard to recall events in their proper sequence or significance. The first Republican president in twenty years was swept into office, Stalin died and was replaced by the subtler and more devious Malenkov, Communist China emerging from the first stages of her internal revolution became a world power to be reckoned with. First the Soviets and then six months later the United States exploded hydrogen bombs, the Indo-China war ended in unhappy and uneasy armistice, and the European Defence Community fell apart to be replaced by a looser formula for German rearmament. For a while during the early part of 1954 the rigidity of American policy created strains within the Atlantic alliance, so severe that it looked—at the time of the Geneva Conference—as if it might break up altogether.

Yet, paradoxically, out of this confused and confusing pattern there has developed in the last two months or so, a greater sense of unity and identity of interest in the West than has existed since the late forties. The western alliance has given itself a shake and gathered its skirts out of the mud. Six months ago—at the time of the negotiation of the Indo-China armistice in Geneva — Sir Anthony Eden was being heavily criticised in the American press, and only a little more discreetly within the Administration itself, for trying to appease the Communists. Now he receives generous and unstinted praise for his initiative in finding in the London and Paris agreements an alternative solution to the defunct European Defence Community. Four months ago M. Mendes France was regarded with the utmost suspicion in Washington as a sly and unpredictable man who would probably make his own deal with the Russians. After his recent visit there, it was clear that there were no substantial differences between the American and the French approach to the question of eventual negotiations with Russia.

At the same time, the distrust which had been growing among the allies of the United States, about the aims and intentions of the Republican Administration, has begun to disappear, it seems to me, in recent months. I think it would be no exaggeration to say that in Britain and Western Europe—and in Canada too—President Eisenhower by the end of last summer—after eighteen months in office—had come to be regarded as a high-minded, well-intentioned but ineffectual President. Mr. Dulles, his Secretary of State, and Admiral Radford, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had come to be regarded as dangerous men who were too ready to contemplate the idea of "preventive war". On top of the marked decline in American prestige which the activities of Senator McCarthy had caused everywhere in the free world, there was a general feeling that the making of policy in the United States was in dangerous hands. This was true not only of professional anti-American factions such as the followers of Aneurin Bevan in Britain, nor of the neutrals who refuse to identify themselves with the West in any case like Mr. Nehru, but also of ordinary sensible people everywhere in the free world.

This sense of alarm and anxiety was fed during the first half of last year by a number of incidents which normally would not have aroused the fears or resentment they did. The failure of the Administration to persuade Congress to liberalise legislation on tariffs and agricultural quotas was a keen disappointment to both exporters of industrial products such as Britain and agricultural products such as Canada. Mr. Dulles's unwise attempt to bully France into ratifying the EDC by the threat of an "agonising reappraisal" of America's commitment to Europe was deeply resented there—the more so as it was an empty threat, since Western Europe remains as strategically vital to the United States as it ever was. His speech of last January 12th in which he outlined American policy as being based on a capacity for "massive retaliation" was followed by the explosion a month or so later of a hydrogen bomb, an explosion which an eyewitness said was so stupendous that it was almost out of control. This turned resentment into alarm; and partly accounted for the fact that no allied government was prepared to consider armed intervention to save the situation in Indo-China, lest it lead by Mr. Dulles's definition to an atomic war. The upshot was that by midsummer of last year the United States was very seriously isolated from her allies.

Since then the solidarity of the Western alliance has improved, as I have said, beyond recognition. President Eisenhower and Sir Winston have made speeches in recent weeks stressing the impossibility and unthinkableness of total war in the hydrogen age, on the necessity of finding a modus vivendi with the Soviets while not relaxing our own armed vigilance—speeches so similar that they might have been written by each other. The governments of Britain, France and the United States have without much difficulty agreed on a common attitude to fresh four power talks with Soviet Russia but only after the London and Paris agreements on German rearmament have been ratified by the various parliaments and have gone into effect. There is even a much wider area of agreement on the Far Eastern policy than has been the case for several years, as the Eisenhower Administration refuses to be drawn into conflict by the provocative sallies of Communist China.

What produced the bickerings of the first half of the year, and the dramatic improvement in allied relations in the second half? The answer to my mind is a very simple one. The improvement is due to the fact that President Eisenhower decided, sometime during the summer, first, that the facts of the atomic and hydrogen age ruled out the use of total war or even the threat of total war as instrument of policy; or that in the words of General Gruenther, the NATO commander, "co-existence was the only alternative to co-destruction"; and second, since this fact was not as clearly accepted throughout his administration as he felt it should be, that he must assert his own authority more directly. The earlier months of discord were due to the fact that the United States had recognised the impossibility of total war a year or more later than its allies, most of whom have had a more direct experience of the effects of total war. It was prepared to take risks which they were not. To any European or Commonwealth statesman who had seen what the comparatively amateurish bombardments of the second war had done both physically and psychologically to Coventry, or Antwerp, Glasgow or Hamburg, Lille or London, the concept of a war in which bombs with 25 to 25,000 times the destructive power of ordinary high explosive bombs was truly terrific. When it became known in August 1953 that the Soviets had exploded a thermonuclear bomb, it became crystal clear in every allied capital save Washington that henceforth total war was to be avoided at all costs. Even total victory in a war in which the Soviets possessed the hydrogen bomb would not in any measure make up for the damage done to the structure of the civilised world. The accumulating evidence of the dangers of widespread radioactive fallout to human life and reproduction have shown that it would endanger civilisation itself. Henceforth the emphasis would have to be on finding some way by which the Communist and the free worlds could live together without blowing the planet, which they jointly inhabit, to smithereens.

If men like Mr. St. Laurent, Sir Winston Churchill or Dr. Konrad Adenauer saw this so clearly a year and more ago, why did it take so long for men as farsighted as Mr. Dulles or as sensitively humanitarian as President Eisenhower to perceive the same thing and translate it into policy? The answer seems to me to come from a mixture of reasons, part political, part strategic, part historical.

If you cast your mind back to the Presidential election campaign of 1952, you will recall the bitterness with which foreign policy was then being discussed. It was dominated by the shadow of the Korean war which had stirred up very strong passions in the United States. For one thing—and something which we are often inclined to overlook, certainly in Britain if not in Canada, the United States sustained very heavy losses in Korea: some 100,000 wounded and 24,000 killed; far higher in proportion to population than any other western country. For another, it was a very frustrating war from an American point of view in that it did not end in victory but in a drawn line. Limited or local war was an absolutely un-American experience. With the possible exception of the war of 1812 all her wars had been wars of total victory. This sense of frustration in American opinion was all tied up with the still unhealed wound to American pride that was made by the loss of China to the Communists. These feelings manifested themselves in various ways; in resentment with the allies, particularly with Britain for having prevented the United States from deploying its full strength in Korea by using atomic weapons or by bombing China itself; in a feeling that the catastrophic turn that events in the Far East had recently taken must be someone's fault, that it must be the result of treason in the American body politic. The one feeling found its hero in MacArthur, the other in McCarthy and McCarran. Although it would probably be wrong to judge that the American people themselves were in a belligerent mood two years ago, since the most popular of all General Eisenhower's campaign promises was that he would end the Korean war, it is true that the most loudmouthed politicians did feed on this sense of public frustration and demanded an implacable attitude towards the Soviet world.

At the same time, the Republican party, coming to office after twenty years in opposition, was under the urgent political compulsion of proving that it had an entirely different approach to foreign policy from the Democrats. They had derided the policy of "containment" as being merely a negative policy which entrenched Soviet Russia in its control of its own people and the satellites. The Korean war, the most effective positive gesture of United Nations solidarity yet made became "Truman's war" and so on. As a result instead of the period of national and western consolidation we had hoped for as a result of the election of so great a figure as General Eisenhower, we had instead a period of lamentable confusion. In January of 1953 a so called "positive" American foreign policy was unveiled which in the catchwords of the time consisted of "taking the wraps off Chiang", "liberation" of the satellites, "psychological offensive" against Russia and a warning to Western Europe that it must "unite or else", the "or else" consisting of vague threats of the withdrawal of American military aid and troops from Europe. You will recall the consternation which that policy created throughout the whole free world.

This situation was complicated, it seems to me, by the fact that the American public was determined never to fight another war like Korea again — a muddy and murderous slogging match on the ground with only limited success, while at the same time the preponderant voices in the new Administration were those of big businessmen who honestly believed that the end of the Korean war meant a return to "normalcy", that is lower taxes which could only be effected by a reduction in the military budget. In consequence the temptation to look for cheaper and easier ways to contain Russia were very strong, by reliance on air and naval power alone and by a reduction in economic aid or so called "giveaways" to Europe and Asia. The outcome of this was the theory of "massive retaliation".

Finally, there was the strategic factor. The Atlantic alliance, and the unquestioned American leadership of it, was created in the days when the United States alone possessed atomic weapons. Ever since the summer of 1949 when Russia exploded her first atomic bomb, it became inevitable that she would one day match the United States in her capacity to obliterate her enemies. Though she started much later and has now a stockpile which may be only one tenth or one hundredth the size of the American, if ten atom bombs will cripple the eight largest cities of the United States plus London and Paris, the difference in total resources is irrelevant. When in the summer of 1953 it was clear that the Soviets had set off a hydrogen bomb, the American superiority began to diminish dramatically. No one knows how many hydrogen bombs the Russians now have, or how many the Americans have for that matter; but in the judgment of people who are well informed in these matters the only decisive superiority which the United States now possesses is in her greater ability to deliver the bomb, that is a superiority in long range aircraft. It is considered unlikely that this lead will be held for more than another two or three years, so that by about 1957 we shall have reached the period that Senator Knowland has called "atomic stalemate", the time when the United States and Russia can destroy each other.

Different people have drawn different conclusions from this fact. To most Europeans and Canadians as I have already suggested and perhaps to some people in the Kremlin, the approaching stalemate rules out the use of atomic weapons, at least other than those tactical weapons that would be used against troops on the battlefield rather than against cities and civil populations. But to many of the higher strategists in the Pentagon, this approaching loss of American strategic superiority did represent an intolerable conception. It meant and means that the vast expenditure of money, brains and ingenuity which has gone into the Atomic Energy programme and into the building of the Strategic Air Command would be neutralised, providing neither a deterrent to aggression nor a sure defence of North America. In consequence there were a number of advocates, probably a small number but certainly influential, who entertained the idea of "preventive war". The idea was never anything so crude as making an unprovoked attack on Russia or China to destroy their atomic capacity, but rather that the United States should not shrink from accepting a military challenge in the next three years even if it meant all out atomic war. It was this line of thinking which lead at least one of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to advocate an American airstrike on Dien Bien Phu when it was on the point of collapse last April, even if it meant that Russia would take up the challenge against the United States.

I have recited so much that is now past history and which is well known to you, in order to point up the contrast between the first year or eighteen months of the Eisenhower administration and the situation that exists now. I cannot sufficiently emphasise the difference in policy and in atmosphere between now and six months ago in Washington.

By the spring of last year the bankruptcy of the Republican Administration's attempt at a "tough" foreign policy had become painfully apparent. Because of the fears that it had raised among the allies of the United States, Mr. Dulles's call last March 29th for a policy of "united action" to arrest the deteriorating military situation in Indo-China fell upon deaf ears in London, Ottawa, and Canberra. In the light of his thesis of "massive retaliation" against local aggression coupled with the explosion of an American hydrogen bomb which the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission admitted could devastate a city the size of New York, it was not surprising that the allies were not anxious to align themselves with a risky policy of intervention in Indo-China. There followed the complicated misunderstanding between Mr. Dulles and Sir Anthony Eden about the creation of a South East Asian regional security pact before the Geneva negotiations had begun, followed by the debacle of American diplomacy when Mr. Dulles withdrew from the Geneva Conference and the United States refused to be a signatory to the armistice agreement.

Then something began to happen of which the signs were only gradually apparent. Sometime between the end of June and the middle of August, President Eisenhower, it is clear in retrospect, began to see the appalling harm that his subordinates were doing—rattling the atom bomb. For my own part I am prepared to date his thinking from the long private conversations he had with Sir Winston Churchill in Washington at the end of June. The first sign of his new thinking was at a press conference in Denver on August 11th when he scouted the idea of a preventive war as unthinkable because of the mass destruction it would cause. Then as the mid-term election campaign began to pick up momentum his speeches in support of Republican candidates were centered around one theme—the peaceful intentions of the United States, and the fact that there was in his own words "no alternative to peace". In speech after speech during the election campaign he went out of his way to stress the achievements of the Republican Administration in the cause of peace, and to rule out total war as an instrument of American policy. There is no doubt at all that this change of emphasis in American policy stemmed directly from the President himself. In Sir Winston Churchill's words he had "looked into the abyss"; he had reflected in the solitude of his summer headquarters in Colorado, on the awful implications of atomic war and had seen that the fact that the United States seemed ready to contemplate such an eventuality, was having an immensely harmful effect upon her relations with her allies and with the uncommitted nations of Asia.

It is no secret that President Eisenhower has been very much criticised in the American press and even in his own administration during the past eighteen months for his indecisiveness and unwillingness to make the Administration and Congress bend to his will. The truth is, I think, that the President feels himself quite inexperienced on many of the problems which he has to face, particularly in domestic affairs, and therefore relies heavily on the advice that he is given. Many of the mistakes that he has made such as the handing of the public power issue and his absurd reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority as "creeping socialism" can be traced back to bad advice tendered to him rather than to his own judgment. But on this central issue of peace and war he feels that he can dispense with the experts and the advisers; as an old soldier he knows his own judgment is better than those of his advisers.

During the last three months the signs that the United States was preparing to accept the fact of co-existence with the Soviet Bloc, in fact, if not in name have begun to accumulate. One of the first signs was the substitution of the policy of "good partnership" with Britain and the other European countries for that American "leadership" which was held to be essential in Washington when the imminence of war was taken as the starting point for policy. In the new atmosphere created by the abandonment of the previous "tough" American policy, the creation of an alternative policy for German rearmament was arrived at in late September at the London and Paris agreements with comparative ease. It was nothing so trivial as an improvement of personal relations between Mr. Dulles and Sir Anthony Eden. It sprang from a definite American decision to let the European nations find their own solution to collective security in Europe, a decision that could not have been taken unless the imminence of war in Europe had been discounted.

Another sign of the acceptance of co-existence is that Washington's opposition to East-West trade has virtually disappeared. Another was that strategic planning was put on long term basis and ceased to be based on the assumption that there would be a year of maximum danger, 1954, 1957 or whatever it might be. Yet another is the new emphasis on economic rather than military aid to the underdeveloped countries in Asia.

But the most convincing signs that the Administration was altering the emphasis of its policy were those concerning its relations with Communist China. At the beginning of November an American B29 was shot down off Japan. There were many Senators who wanted the United States to make some form of reprisal or other, but the President himself said that the issue was a cloudy one, that it was not clear whether the plane was or was not over Soviet-controlled territory. About the same time it became known that the President had vetoed last September a three-to-one recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that would have called for retaliatory American action against the Chinese mainland if the nationalist held island of Quemoy was attacked.

Last week the President and Mr. Dulles in effect ratified the fact that the China policy with which they took office has now been abandoned. The new Mutual Security Treaty between the US and Nationalist China does not commit the United States to support the Nationalists if they make any move against the mainland. Moreover while the treaty commits the United States to the defence of Formosa and the Pescadores Islands it is most discreetly silent on the question of the other offshore islands which are still in Nationalist hands.

Of equal significance has been the manner in which President Eisenhower has handled the case of the thirteen Americans sentenced to prison by Peking. This is the most glaring and provocative gesture with which Red China has faced the United States; I find it hard to believe the timing of its announcement, coming as it did on the eve of Thanksgiving day, was accidental. It lead Senator Knowland, the Republican majority leader, to demand that an American blockade of the China coast be imposed if they were not immediately released—and in this Senator Knowland had probably a good deal of public support. If the counter-revolutionary policy which the Administration was proclaiming when it came into office nearly two years ago were still in force it would be only too easy to have used the abominable behaviour of Peking as the occasion for a showdown. Yet on November twenty-ninth in Chicago Mr. Dulles declared that a naval blockade of China would only be considered as a last resort after all other international means had been exhausted. Last Thursday at his press conference the President went even further and declared that a naval blockade was inseparable from an act of war. Of even greater significance were his general remarks on the subject."We must make certain," he said, "that our efforts to promote peace are not interpreted as appeasement . . . but we must on the other hand be steady and refuse to be goaded into actions that would be unwise." Thus it seems to be that there is definitely a new emphasis in American policy. The President has had to make the choice between maintaining the cohesion of the Western alliance and maintaining the unity of the Republican party; and he has chosen the former. The split in the party which goes back many decades was vividly illustrated by the vote on the censure of Senator McCarthy when some twenty-three Republican senators voted against censure and some twenty-two for it. Most significant of all Senator William Knowland, the Republican leader in the Senate who strongly disapproves of the President's new and more cautious foreign policy, voted with the pro-McCarthy forces, although he has never shown himself sympathetic to McCarthyism before. It may well be that he will become the rallying point of opposition to the President's new policy with its acceptance of co-existence, and a source of grave embarrassment to him. I should judge that President Eisenhower has accepted this possibility and is prepared for the open opposition of his party's right wing in the Senate . . . particularly since he has the evidence of the election campaign to show him that his own line is not only acceptable to the vast majority of opinion in the country but also extremely popular.

Well, Gentlemen, that is the situation in Washington as I see it. It is an encouraging situation for it means that the unity of the western alliance can now be restored upon a basis of mutual confidence and identity of interest. Now that it is being restored both Moscow and Peking should soon see the fruitlessness of trying to drive a wedge between the United States and its allies.

I do not want to overpaint this picture. Because the United States is now prepared to accept a modus vivendi with the Soviets does not mean that we are going to get it. For instance there is no sign that Moscow is prepared to settle the question of an Austrian peace treaty which would be the most obvious evidence of a desire to relax tensions. Equally there is a great deal of evidence that she has no intention of relaxing her grip over east Germany. Moreover even if Russia is prepared to negotiate a relaxation of tension in the west, all the signs point to the fact that Communist China is still in an extremely aggressive stage of her own revolution and will cause endless trouble in Asia. Nor has the United States any clear idea of what concessions it would be prepared to make to achieve any lasting settlement of East-West tensions.

Nevertheless the fact that American opinion and American policy have now realigned themselves with the feelings and policies of the other free nations does represent a gain in the strength of the West of the greatest possible importance.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. James H. Joyce.

"CHRISTMAS MEETING"

With DR. LESLIE BELL and THE LESLIE BELL SINGERS

featuring

"STORY OF THE NATIVITY IN MUSIC AND VERSE"

Thursday, December 16th, 1954

CHAIRMAN: The President Mr. James H. Joyce.

Dr. C. C. Goldring, the Second Vice-President of the Club, introduced Dr. Leslie Bell.

DR. GOLDRING: Abour twenty years ago, in the course of my duties with the Toronto Board of Education, I recommended the appointment of a young man named Leslie Bell to the staff of Parkdale Collegiate Institute, to teach English, History and Music.

In a short time, he established a good reputation as a teacher, especially in the field of music. In 1939 he resigned to accept a position at the Ontario College of Education to instruct budding teachers concerning music. Meanwhile, some of his former students at Parkdale Collegiate Institute wished to continue to study with him so he formed a choir composed of graduates of the school. This was the beginning of the now famous Leslie Bell Choir.

He continued to instruct at the Ontario College of Education and developed his Choir, which took more and more of his time. He took it to sing in many places in Canada and the United States and it has been prominent on radio programmes for some years. He finally had to relinquish his duties at the Ontario College of Education and devote his full time to the work of the Choir, which is now favourably known in all parts of Canada. It is the outstanding organization of its kind in this country and it is with both pleasure and pride that I introduce to this audience Dr. Leslie Bell and his Choir.

— THE CHOIR SANG —

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. Donald H. Jupp, Third Vice-President of the Club.

"SCOTTISH HOME RULE"

An Address by

ROY HERBERT THOMSON

Chairman, The Scotsman Publications Limited

Thursday, January 6th, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: Our speaker today—Roy Herbert Thomson—is one of Canada's leading newspaper publishers. Born in Toronto sixty years ago, Roy Thomson left school at 14 to take a job worth less than a dollar a day. In the early 1930's Mr. Thomson entered the radio field with the acquisition of the radio station in North Bay. Later he established stations at Timmins and at Kirkland Lake. This broadcasting expansion brought him into contact with his first newspaper enterprise, the Timmins Press, then a weekly, but which he turned into a daily a few years after its acquisition. From then on his expansion in the newspaper field was rapid.

Today he owns twenty daily newspapers and six weekly newspapers. In addition to the three radio stations in the north country, he operates, in partnership with Senator Rupert Davies, others at Kingston and at Peterborough and a new television station at Kingston. They also have a new T.V. station at Peterborough under construction.

A recent big step forward in his career has been the acquisition of the Scotsman Publications in Edinburgh, Scotland which included the Scotsman of Edinburgh, the Weekly Scotsman and the Evening Dispatch.

Mr. Thomson has been spending most of his time over in Edinburgh directing these papers, making occasional trips back to Canada to supervise his enterprises here.

He will speak to us on the contentious subject of "Scottish Home Rule".

MR. THOMSON: Shortly after six o'clock on Christmas morning in the year 1950, a night watchman going his rounds in Westminster Abbey was astonished to discover that someone had tampered with the Coronation Chair in the chapel of Edward the Confessor. The bar of wood which kept the Coronation Stone in place beneath the seat, had been removed and the Stone itself gone. The watchman promptly phoned the police and thus began a mystery which was not fully solved until April 11th, 1951, when the Stone reappeared in the ancient Abbey of Arbroath in Scotland.

It can be said for the authorities that there was little enough reason to imagine that anyone would attempt to remove the Stone. It is a block of Scottish sandstone measuring 26½ inches by 16½ inches, and weighing about 300 lbs. Those who removed it say it weighted 400 lbs. No doubt it felt like that.

You remember the hue and cry. Police officers dragged the Serpentine in Hyde Park and announced that they had got something that seemed to be about the right size. It was found to be a piece of concrete. Towards the end of January, a diviner declared that the Stone was buried somewhere along the River Thames, and that it had never left London.

Authority, however, reached firmer conclusions when it asked itself who might be interested in this Stone. It had been brought to England from Scone in 1296 as part of the war loot of Edward I, the Hammer of the Scots, and had reposed in Westminster Abbey since then, though it was removed temporarily once or twice.

There was a prophecy attached to it which said that the Scots would reign in whatever country the Stone was found. It was not a very good prophecy, for no Scot reigned in England from 1296 till 1603, when James the Sixth of Scotland became the First of England. But there is no doubt that for a long time before 1286, when Alexander III died, Scottish Kings had sat on the Stone of

Scone at their inauguration. It seemed clear, therefore, that some Scots might have a motive to remove the Stone.

The story of the removal of the Stone has been told by the chief participant in the enterprise, Ian Hamilton, now a young Edinburgh advocate, in his book " No Stone Unturned". It is an exciting story—as good as any thriller. Three men and a girl went down from Glasgow to London. Two days before Christmas, Ian Hamilton hid in the Abbey just before it was closed for the night. He was, however, discovered and shown the door. It looked like failure. But on Christmas Eve the party decided to try again. About midnight they noticed a wooden boarding with a door and on forcing the door, they found they had reached the door leading to Poets' Corner. This they also forced and reached the Confessor's Chapel. As they were moving the Stone, it fell apart in two pieces, apparently an old fracture. Hamilton took the smaller part of the Stone outside to the girl who was waiting with the car. At this point a policeman appeared and became quite chatty. He told them they would have to move on to a car park a little away. While they were chatting, there was a noise behind the boarding, and the policeman humorously remarked that it was the old watchman falling downstairs. Hamilton saw the door open and one of his friends peering out. Fortunately for the enterprise, his friend saw the policeman and gently closed the door.

That was by no means the end of the adventure, but it is unnecessary to go into details. Suffice to say that the Stone was successfully removed just before the watchman made his early morning round. It was taken out of London and deposited in a hollow 2½ miles from Rochester. The smaller part meanwhile went north to Scotland.

Those who effected the removal returned to Scotland. After that the problem was to get the larger part of the Stone from Rochester across the Border. This was accomplished before New Year came in. The Stone was deposited somewhere near Stirling and was solemnly produced at Arbroath Abbey in April, after which the police took it to Westminster.

The reactions to this enterprise were interesting. The "Law Journal"—an English production—wrote heavily, "To break out of a place of divine worship after a commission of felony therein is sacrilege, a crime punishable by imprisonment for life." The papers in the case were sent to the Director of Public Prosecutions in April, but Sir Hartley Shawcross, as Attorney General, decided not to prosecute. He relieved English feelings by speaking of "vulgar acts of vandalism."

In Scotland there was not the same sense of indignation and outrage. There was a tinge of amusement at the thought that what Edward I had sacrilegiously removed from Scotland had disappeared from under the nose of authority and that the police had been so long at a loss although they had imposed a watch on the roads across the Border. There was also a desire in Scotland that the perpretrators of this deed should not suffer the utmost rigour of the law. It was clearly intended as a political demonstration.

But what did the participants hope to gain by their deed, Why did they do it, Mr. Hamilton supplied the answer. "I had great hopes", he writes "that as a stroke in a war of propaganda, the removal of the Stone would be a great success. I hoped also that it might go beyond propaganda, and help to restore Scotland's faith in herself." Undoubtedly this episode attracted a great deal of public attention but it contributed little to the cause of Scottish Home Rule. Indeed, when I spoke to Ian Hamilton the other day, he did not disagree with my statement to that effect. The measure of its failure in this respect is shown by the attitude of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in May 1951. The Assembly was not unsympathetic to the idea of increasing the amount of self-government which Scotland enjoyed. It had passed resolutions in that sense for a number of years, but when it was asked by its own Church and Nation Committee to advocate the retention of the Stone in Scotland, it declined to make any pronouncement. Whatever it might have felt if this proposal had been put forward in other circumstances, the Assembly was clearly averse to being associated with an act of this kind. In this the Assembly probably reflected moderate opinion in Scotland. Naturally extreme Nationalists were delighted at the way the English lion's tail had been twisted, though they probably regretted that they had no hand in the business.

Mr. Hamilton belongs to the Scottish National Covenant movement and not to the Scottish National Party. "Our fight," he says "is not for separation, but for a better Union." The covenant movement stands for a Scottish Parliament but "within the framework of the United Kingdom". Devolution not independence is the goal. All things considered, the Stone episode was something of an irrelevance.

To us, perhaps, in Canada, the recital of ancient wrongs going back to Edward I and beyond may seem to have little enough to do with the present time, but it is important to realize that Scottish claims for Home Rule, in whatever form, are deeply rooted in history. If Irish people have not forgotten Cromwell, Scots have not forgotten Edward I. After all, the Scottish nation was forged in the struggle with England and maintained itself down to 1707 against its powerful neighbour. The Stone was produced at Arbroath Abbey in 1951 because it was from there in 1320 that one of the finest expressions of Scottish national feeling was addressed to the Pope of the day, who was leaning to England's side and threatening to excommunicate Bruce. In this letter, which was written for them in all probability, by Bernard, Abbot of Arbroath, the Barons of Scotland said, "So long as one hundred men remain alive, we shall never under any conditions submit to the domination of the English. It is not for glory or riches or honours that we fight, but only for liberty, which no good man will consent to lose but with his life".

I have mentioned the two main bodies at present advocating some form of Scottish Home Rule. The difference between them is this. The Scottish National Party want "the restoration of Scottish National Sovereignty by the establishment of a democratic Scottish Government, freely elected by the Scottish people, and whose authority will be limited only by such agreements as will be freely entered into with other nations or states for the purpose of furthering international co-operation and world peace". This claim would extend to complete independence. It might be compatible with the status of a member of the Commonwealth. But it is incompatible with the maintenance of the United Kingdom. The Covenant movement, on the other hand, proposes to keep the framework of the United Kingdom but to give Scotland a Parliament which would legislate for Scottish affairs. The scheme which they have put forward is on lines not wholly unfamiliar to Canadians. Certain matters would be reserved for the United Kingdom Parliament, such as questions intimately affecting the Crown, questions of peace and war, defence, foreign affairs, most taxes, currency and so forth, while in purely Scottish affairs the Scottish Parliament would be supreme. That is the general idea without going into particulars about cases where concurrent powers might be desirable.

The Covenant, and the blue-print which the Covenant summarises, sets out in considerable detail just what type of Parliament is proposed for Scotland. What is envisaged is not unlike the Provincial Parliaments in Canada. In many respects, it would possess less powers than are vested in Canadian Provincial Governments. At the present time, there are 71 Scottish Members of Parliament at Westminster. The plan is that there should be double this number, 142, in the Scottish Parliament. Initially, it is proposed that the same number of Scottish Members will sit in Westminster, although it is likely that this representation would be decreased eventually in view of the fact that purely Scottish affairs would be handled by the Scottish Parliament. This is the basis which now exists in Ulster.

It is a fact, and the Covenanters freely admit and approve of it, that the Government at Westminster has gradually extended the control of Scottish affairs by Scots, and transferred this control in many departments of government from Westminster to St. Andrews House in Edinburgh. This has been steadily progressing over recent years.

The years of Socialist rule after the war made devolution seem more attractive to modern minds. Bureauracy tends to become centralised, at least it certainly did under the Labour Government in England. The control of nationalised industry gravitated to London. Britain is, of course, much more a Socialist state than is Canada, and again these operations are largely centred in London. The whole trend of control and direction seems to have departed from Scotland, and this causes Scots to think that Scotland's interests are being neglected.

It is considered that Death Duties in Britain are a fair indication of the relative contributions of various sections of the country to the National Treasury. On this basis, a recent Government White Paper states that Scotland contributes £410,000,000, about 9½%, of the total United Kingdom revenue. Figures indicate that slightly more than half the national income goes for purposes of defence and other integrated services of Britain as a whole. From its total contribution of £410,000,000, Scotland has been allocated about £230,000,00 for Scottish domestic services. This amount represents about 12% of the total amount allocated for all the United Kingdom domestic services. Therefore, while they are contributing 9½%, they are getting back 12%. On the face of it this would look to be over-generous treatment, and so it is. But to offset this, it is claimed that an undue portion of Government spending takes place in England. Over the years industries tended to amalgamate and their headquarters became located in England. Amalgamation of the railways had transferred the management south, and a large part of their construction and repair work went to England. The great naval base of Rosyth had been put by the Government on a care and maintenance basis. It was, in fact, widely suspected in Scotland and hotly denied in

England, that English officers preferred the delights of Picadilly to exile on the shores of the Firth of Forth. This was reversed during the war when Rosyth had to be opened to meet the German menace. Many of the leading Scottish banks have amalgamated with English institutions, and altogether, the control of industry and commerce tended to become concentrated in England.

Dr. McCormick, who is the Chairman of the Scottish Covenant Association, recently told me that the Covenanters are entirely satisfied with the present allocation of revenue for Scottish domestic services and that their plans for a Scottish parliament do not envisage a demand for any larger percentage of the total United Kingdom revenue. They are also not dissatisfied with the various controls over Scottish domestic affairs which have been transferred from Westminster to St. Andrews House. What they want is for a Scottish Parliament, sitting in Edinburgh, to have control of the spending of this money and have them do the things which are now being done by the Westminster Government through the permanent staff at St. Andrews House. This would give the Scottish Parliament control of how they would spend the money, and what projects would get priority.

While they are satisfied with the allocation to Scotland of their share of the total United Kingdom revenue on the present basis, and they ask for no taxing powers with respect to indirect taxes, they want some control over the rates of some direct taxes, notably Corporation Taxes and Death Duties. They point out the fact that the Scottish economy differs materially from that of England. In Scotland, the Companies, generally speaking, are small, and there is a much higher percentage of private limited Companies as compared to public limited companies, as in England. The present Corporation Tax set-up, which is applicable to Britain as a whole, is not, in their view, on the best basis for Scotland. Also, they believe that the present taxation is not in the best interest of the very much larger number of self-employed persons in Scotland, as compared with England. These, and other differences in the general business set-up between the two countries are such that they believe Scottish prosperity could be materially assisted if, in these respects, taxes could have different aims and objects in Scotland to those now existing which are no doubt entirely applicable to Britain as a whole. They do not seek to change the general level of taxation with respect to the total amount of taxes to be collected.

One of the standard arguments against a Scottish Parliament is the general statement that Scotland is a poor country and is, in effect, subsidised by England. Scotsmen resolutely refute this argument. They point out that statistics conclusively prove that Scotland, with 10% of the population of Great Britain, produces 15% of the steel, 12% of the coal, and 40% of the shipbuilding and allied heavy industries.

It is a fact that Scotland in many respects is quite different to England. For instance, there is not nearly so much class distinction in Scotland, and this results to a considerable extent from the Clan system. Many Scots claim membership in one of other of the Clans, and the Head of the Clan, however high-placed he may be, is regarded by the most lowly member as just a member of the family. This tends greatly to break down the barriers between classes and is reflected all through Scottish life.

Those who support the Covenant point out the fact that there is much in Scottish law and practices which is outmoded, and should be modernised. They claim that everyone is agreed that this should be the case, but it is relatively unimportant in London, and no action is taken. Scottish law is almost completely different in practically every respect to English law, and this applies to both Civil and Criminal Law. For instance, in Scottish Criminal law, there is not just "Guilty" or "Not Guilty" as a verdict, but there is also a third alternative "Not Proven". This is a most peculiar device, whereby if not enough evidence can be produced against an accused to warrant his being found "Guilty", and sentenced, he is discharged under a verdict of "Not Proven", which, of course, indicates that there is grave suspicion that he is "Guilty", but not enough evidence is available to make a finding accordingly. To those of us, and the English people as well, who are used to a man being "Innocent" until he is found "Guilty", this is a very peculiar device indeed.

Then, Scottish law is most peculiar with respect to the fact that no chattel mortgage or charge of any kind may be placed against movable property, unless such property is actualy delivered and kept in the custody of the person holding the mortgage. This results in a very strange method of selling motor cars on a time payment basis. The individual who purchases a car does not in effect make the purchase at all. He has a Finance Company do this and they, in turn, rent him the car until such time as he has completed all his payments, and then they deliver over to him the title. It would seem obvious that such a subterfuge should not be necessary and that the law should be changed accordingly.

The rating system in Scotland is outmoded and a positive hindrancee to the whole property-owning system. Civic taxes are levied not, as in Canada, on the basis of an assessment of the worth of the property, but instead on a basis of the rent which the property will bring. Part of this rating is levied against the tenant, and part of it against the owner. It exists only in Scotland and should be changed.

Those who support the Covenant say that there is substantial agreement on all such matters among all parties and all peoples in Scotland, and that the reason these things are not done is just because of the fact that Westminster is too busy with other and more important matters to divert their energies to do so. However, this statement is resolutely denied by the permanent officials at St. Andrews House. They affirm that these, and other matters, are very controversial and the reason that changes are not made is because of the fact that opinion is so divided not only among Scottish members of Parliament but among all the people of Scotland as well.

Neither the Conservative nor the Labour Parties want anything to do with Parliamentary devolution. The Conservatives believe that everything necessary can be done by transferring more and more control of Scottish affairs from London to St. Andrews House in Edinburgh. The Labour Party, if their past performance, and their present disinterest, is any indication, are even more opposed. Labour policy is clearly centralised control from London and during their term of office they did little to give the Scost more control over their own affairs.

As there is more pressure exerted, the Conservatives over the years have carried on one step of devolution after another. In 1926 they raised the Secretaryship for Scotland to the rank of Secretaryship of State. In 1937, they transferred the main Scottish administrative centre from Dover House in Whitehall to St. Andrews House in Edinburgh. In 1948, the Socialist Government which was then in power arranged that the second reading of a Scottish bill could be taken in the Scottish Standing Committee was also permitted o discuss Scottish estimates for six days in each session. The next year the Conservatives, where were then in opposition, promised that if they were returned they would appoint a Minister of State and an additional Under-Secretary. This promise was carried out when they were elected. This is a kind of internal devolution in connection with Scottish affairs by the House of Commons.

In 1952, the Conservative Government appointed a Royal Commission on Scottish affairs but Ministerial statements at the time of their appointment made it clear that they were not intended to include consideration of Parliamentary devolution. This Royal Commission brought in their report recently. They felt that there was a lack of knowledge of the extent to which devolution of Scottish affairs had already taken place. They were clearly concerned with administrative devolution and not, as those subscribing to the Covenant want, political devolution. Their report referred briefly to the Provincial type of Parliament that exists in Northern Ireland, but just as briefly they stated that it was their opinion that while this worked in Northern Ireland, it would not further the special needs and interests of Scotland. In Scotland, they say, devolution has taken an indigenous but different form.

A crucial question is whether Scotland wants Home Rule. I am quite convinced that those who want Scotland to have complete independence are very few indeed. The more extreme Nationalists are not representative of Scottish opinion, but there does seem to be no doubt that many men of moderate views feel that Scotland should have greater control of her own affairs. This view has undoubtedly been strengthened by the increased intervention on the part of Government in everyday life and business, by the complexity of administration and by the irritations that arise from remote control. Businessmen, who in the thirties saw little amiss with arrangements which assumed that the centre of gravity of Britain was on the Thames, are less confident today that all is well. Indeed, it could be said that the case for devolution, though fortified by appeals to Scottish patriotism, is largely based today on dissatisfaction with remote control from Whitehall and Westminster and on discontent with planning, which from the very point of its origination, inevitably takes too little account of Scottish conditions and needs.

The most important recommendation in the Commission's Report, is that Scottish roads, bridges and ferries should be under the control of the Secretary of State for Scotland, which means that these services would be administered from St. Andrews House and not from London. The Government quickly accepted this recommendation and this transfer will take place in 1956. This will undoubtedly remove an important point of dissatisfaction.

One of the most prevalent arguments in connection with a Scottish Parliament is that it would be continuously dominated by Labour. However, the Covenant claim that this is not the case. They point out that in he last election in the United Kingdom as a whole, Labour polled more votes than Conservatives and National Liberals, combined, whereas in Scotland the situation was reversed by some 80,000 votes.

What evidence is there that the aims of the Covenanters have general public acceptance in Scotland? Politicians in general claim that it is a narrow movement and does not command any wide public acceptance. However, the Covenanters point out that in 1949, they were able to get over two million signatures out of a total Scottish electorate at that time of 3,420,000 endorsing it. This is 40% of the people in Scotland, and would seem, on the face of it, to be quite impressive. However, most of us know that petitions are signed with very little consideration and much of this support is probably due partly at least to the generality of the Covenanters' aims. Though the movement has produced a blue-print of a constitution, its adherents are pledged only to securing "in all loyalty to the Crown and within the framework of the United Kingdom" a Parliament for Scotland "with adequate legislative authority in Scottish Affairs". A clearer definition might bring division among the supporters of this general purpose.

The Covenanters claim to have made private spot checks of the feeling on several occasions. They claim that in Scotstoun, a Glasgow industrial district, in 1950 postcards were sent out to all voters. They say 50% were returned and of all these 80% approved of the Covenant. They also claim that in Kirriemuir in Angus in a plebiscite in 1949, 90% of the voters cast their ballots and of these 80% were in favour of a measure of self-government in Scotland. They want a national plebiscite on the quesiton, but this has been refused by the Government on the basis that this procedure is not part of the constitutional arrangements of the United Kingdom. Legislation is effected by Parliament and the Government said, in effect, that if Home Rule was wanted it was the business of those who wanted it to see that the Members of Parliament pledged to work for it were returned to Parliament. This is constutionally correct, but inasmuch as Members of Parliament just do not make an election issue of Scottish Home Rule, it is clear that other issues outrank it in importance. Conservative members are more concerned with preventing the return of a Socialist Government committed to further nationalisation and Labour candidates are more interested in advancing that cause.

It would seem that a possible step would be for the Covenanters to put up their own candidates and contest seats in Parliament. They say that if they were to do this it would result in defeat of many Conservative candidates and weigh the scales heavily in favor of Labour. They certainly do not want the return of a Labour Government because Labour has given no evidence of sympathy at all for political devolution and much less than the Conservatives for administrative devolution for Scotland.

If their cause has wide-spread support, it should be possible for them to arrange for town or city councils to take a plebiscite at the time of their regular election. However, they say that what stops this is the fact that the Government have control over all such spending by councils and they will not approve the appropriation of money for such a purpose. They say they have pretty well arranged for a plebiscite in Falkirk this year. It seems the Council there has a common good fund which does not come under the control of the Secretary of State and which they can use for such purposes as they desire. They believe that the Council there will approve of a plebiscite to be financed from that fund.

If so, while the result will be very interesting indeed it will be by no means conclusive. The wording would be all important. I think there is no doubt that any Scot who was asked if he favoured more control of Scottish affairs by Scotsmen in Scotland, would answer in the affirmative. But the trouble would start as soon as an attempt was made to spell out just what control would be exercised, on what basis of finance and all the details that would be necessary in order to carry the policy to a conclusion.

There is no clear-cut answer to the whole matter. There is no question that the more administrative devolution takes place the less pressure there will be for any form of political devolution. It is likewise certain that the more Scottish affairs are administered from St. Andrews House in Edinburgh, the closer the Government will be to the Scots people. This is most desirable from the standpoint of good Government and in the interest of peace and harmony between Scotland and England.

"The Scotsman", the national newspaper of Scotland, has always been considered to be sympathetic to those elements in Scotland which over the years have pressed for more control of Scottish affairs by Scotsmen in Scotland. This sympathy and editorial support has never quite extended to the point where "The Scotsman" has advocated a Parliament for Scotland. They do support continuing administrative devolution of Scottish affairs to Scotland and it would seem to me that this is a very sound policy to pursue and very much in the best interests of both Scotland and England.

I think anyone who intimated this whole problem has any imminence of becoming a serious factor in the good relationship between England and Scotland is considerably exaggerating its importance. However, this is the kind of problem which, if not given sympathetic and intelligent consideration, can grow in importance and be much more difficult to settle in the future.

I believe in recent years the British governments have by their transfer of administration from London to Edinburgh done much to placate Scottish feelings and while I would expect "The Scotsman", I am speaking of the newspaper, to continue to support those who want more and more control of Scottish affairs exercised in Scotland, I would not expect that it would feel that it had to advocate anything more drastic if administrative devolution continues to take place on a reasonable basis over the future years.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Dr. Clarence B. Crummey.

"THE MODERN MEDICAL SCHOOL —ITS AIMS AND OBLIGATIONS"

An Address by

J. A. MacFARLANE
Dean of the Faculty of Medicine
University of Toronto

Thursday, January 13th, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: Whenever anyone gets very sick, the first person he thinks of is a doctor. Whenever we hear of sickness, we discuss the latest remedies, and the advances that have or have not been made in medical science. Thus everyone of us is interested in the question of doctors and their training at some time or other.

In our speaker today—Dr. J. Arthur MacFarlane—we are fortunate in having a man who is both a leader in his profession and the head of one of the largest and most important schools of medicine on this continent.

Born in Lanark County in 1893, Dr. MacFarlane was educated in Saskatchewan, earning his B.A. at the University of Saskatchewan and was awarded a Rhodes Scholarship.

From 1916 to 1918 he served with the 11th Field Ambulance and then took his medical training at the University of Toronto, graduating in 1922. He also studied at Oxford University and Edinburgh University and earned his F.R.C.S. in 1925.

Returning to Toronto, he joined the staff of the Department of Surgery of the University of Toronto and the Toronto General Hospital.

During World War II, he was consulting surgeon with the rank of Brigadier to the Canadian Army Overseas.

In 1946 he was appointed the first full time dean of the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Toronto, a post he still fills. Since 1945 he has also been director of surgery at Christie Street, which is now Sunnybrook Hospital and consultant in surgery to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

He will speak to us on "The Modern Medical School—Its Aims and Obligations".

DEAN MacFARLANE: It may at first thought seem rather strange to you, that the Empire Club should devote one of its meetings to a subject such as a medical school. There is, however, no lack of public interest in medical affairs. Indeed, it was a trite remark, that the average doctor must not neglect his week-end reading of "Time" or the "Reader's Digest", and other lay magazines, if he would be as well informed as his patients. I hope then, that I may for a few minutes interest you in that centre in your own metropolitan area, in which doctors are born, medical investigation is fostered, and where a group of men and women devote their time to teaching and research, and in a general way to keeping their fingers on the pulse of the community and of the nation.

It is true that as early as there is any record of human scholarly effort there seems to have been an interest in the study of medicine. In the earliest writing of Egypt, of Arabia, of Greece and Rome there are many references to it. Frequently they are associated with philosophy or religion, and indeed, that is not difficult to understand. Most medical theories in those days were the result of philosophical speculation rather than of scientific investigation. Here and there down the ages schools were established, frequently as the result of the teaching of some single great scholar, who unfolded a little further the riddle of the human body and its anatomy and physiology. Sometimes the schools were associated with universities; sometimes they gained renown as independent centres of scholarship and learning.

Only towards the middle of the 18th century was the scientific method beginning to affect seriously the study and practice of medicine in the western world, and great schools were established in Britain and on the Continent. It may be interesting to review the development of medical education in the United States, for, to a lesser degree, the same influences were at work in Canada.

With the rapid development of the United States, and the increasing knowledge of medicine, medical education for a time became a field—and a very profitable one—for private enterprise. No laws governed the entrance qualifications to these schools. A degree from a proprietary school admitted the successful candidate to unrestricted practice. Between 1809 and 1909, 457 medical schools were established in the United States and Canada. 155 were still in operation in 1909. The majority of these had no relation to a university. They advertised for students; there were few admission requirements; instruction was a series of didactic lectures; the course lasted one or two years. The fees covered all the expenses and usually the schools were able to declare a profit. As soon as they failed to do so, they closed their doors and their sponsors departed for greener fields in the newer western towns. The movement was largely American in origin, and the corrective effects of the better American students who had studied in Britain, Holland and France became gradually apparent.

In 1907 when Abraham Flexner of the Johns Hopkins School undertook, with the sponsorship of the Carnegie Foundation, a survey of medical education in the United States and Canada, the corrective measures were already in operation, but the report clarified the situation with clear-cut recommendations; namely: the return to the basic sciences as the only foundation on which to build an education in medicine; the maintenance of reasonable standards of entrance; the association with universities, and the recognition by the universities that the establishment of a faculty of medicine carries with it the responsibility of financial support far beyond the amount which is represented by the fees collected from the students; and finally, the association of medical schools with hospitals under the educational control of the school.

What changes have been wrought in less than half a century! The Flexner report was written in 1909. It altered the whole approach to medical education in the United States. The system which we had developed in Canada had always derived much more of its tradition from Britain and France, but undoubtedly was, and continues to be, influenced by the recommendations of this report.

Each of the twelve medical schools in Canada is an integral part of a university, and the degree conferred on successful candidates is the degree of that university. Each school has an arrangement or agreement with one or more hospitals, whereby it can carry on clinical teaching in the wards, laboratories and out-patient departments of such hospitals. The admission requirements vary slightly, but curriculum requirements throughout the course are such that candidates from each of the twelve colleges are eligible to try the examinations of the Medical Council of Canada, which gives the successful examinee the right to register and practise in any province in Canada.

What then are the objectives of a medical school? Certainly one of the first is the basic training of young men and women in the profession and art of medicine. After two to four years of preparation in college work, the average student begins his professional programme at about 21 years of age. In the succeeding four years, beginning with the basic studies of anatomy, physiology and biochemistry, he progresses by well planned stages towards the final year, when all his instruction is given in the wards and lecture theatres of the hospitals. It is not difficult to understand that those responsible for planning this basic course of undergraduate training must continually revise the curriculum in the light of new researches in human physiology, chemistry and pathology, and the tremendous advances in the understanding and treatment of disease which have resulted from such investigations, particularly in the past 40 years.

What is the place of a Canadian medical school in the national life of Canada? To answer this question it might be profitable to examine our own school, for although it may differ from others in certain details of organization and practice, it will serve as a reasonable example when considering aims and objectives.

This school is one of the largest on the continent. Each year approximately 150 young men and women complete their undergraduate course. Until the opening of new faculties in the west and at Ottawa, the Toronto school produced approximately 25 per cent of the new Canadian graduates. Even now the annual output is about 17 per cent of the newly qualified doctors in the nation. There are at present nearly 6,000 living graduates, and in the last ten years we have qualified some 1,500 doctors. However, this task is but a part of the three-fold responsibility of a modern medical school in the western world. As well as a source of sound and progressive undergraduate teaching, it must be the spearhead of research, and it should also be a centre for postgraduate education of specialists in various fields, as well as a community centre of continuing education of the practising physicians in the area which it serves. Its realm of influence in this last function will, of course, vary with the nature of its scholarship and research, and the degree to which it wishes to assume such a responsibility.

Medical schools are being perpetually confronted with new and difficult questions, which challenge the enquiring mind. They are not only the repositories of the knowledge accumulated through centuries of effort, but the principal sources of new medical knowledge. Research is no longer a superimposed function, but has become an integral part of the school's daily life. Investigation, enquiry, the search for truth—these are of necessity the very essence of sound teaching. A review of the annual report from the school, and the list of publications, will show the diversity and the scope of research which is carried on in the eighteen teaching departments, and in the special department of medical research under the direction of

Professor Best, whose work on insulin with Banting, McLeod and Collip gave such a tremendous impetus to the investigational aspect of medicine in this centre.

The increased demand for special postgraduate training, both in the basic sciences and in the clinical fields, is a reflection of the tremendous increase in medical knowledge and the diversity of techniques, and the recognition of the fact that only by long years of application can one perfect his knowledge and skill in certain special fields. In a measure it reflects also the maturing of Canada as a nation. When I finished my undergraduate course a little more than 30 years ago, forty per cent of a large class left immediately for the United States. The reason—there were insufficient hospital interneships in this country, and few opportunities for intensive postgraduate training. At the present time there are still those who seek their hospital training in the United States from choice, but there are more than enough interneships in Canada to provide training for our newly qualified doctors.

In our own school and its associated hospitals at the present time, there are in training for the various specialties, in programmes which take from three to five years, some 250 doctors. Some will take higher degrees in the School of Graduate Studies in the University; others will qualify for specialist diplomas of our own school; others will enter the teaching or research field here or elsewhere; and a large number will take the examinations of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons in Canada.

As well as the specialist training programme, the school provides annually several short courses for practitioners. These vary in length from three days to six weeks. It carries on a programme of decentralized postgraduate education in six other towns or cities in the province, by sending out teachers who spend a day with the doctors at the community hospitals, leading discussion groups on problems presented by the local doctors themselves.

To effect this diversified task, the Faculty of Medicine, as a division of the University, functions through its eighteen teaching departments—each with a considerable degree of autonomy, but linked to the other departments—through several committees, and in an overall Council on which sit some 150 members of the teaching staff. Moreover, there are close relations to many of the other schools, faculties, and institutes which are interested in the problems of health: the School of Hygiene which fosters the teaching and investigation in public health; the School of Nursing; the Faculty of Dentistry; the Institute of Child Study; the Faculty of Pharmacy; the School of Physical and Health Education, and the School of Social Work. It offers through many of its departments, instruction to students from several of these faculties. The students in Dentistry come to us for their anatomy and physiology; the students in Pharmacy come for their instruction in pharmacology. Students in certain honour courses in the Faculty of Arts come for biochemistry and physiology. The Faculty of Medicine also includes a Division of Physical and Occupational Therapy of some 275 students. The Department of Art as Applied to Medicine offers a course in medical illustration, and at the same time provides an art service for the other departments of the Faculty.

The doctors who are members of the staffs of the teaching hospitals assist in the teaching programmes of the Nursing Schools which are associated with those hospitals. The specialists in Radiology teach classes of radiographers. Pathologists assist in the teaching of laboratory technicians, and, indeed, this is as it should be. Doctors are keenly interested in the training and welfare of all those who seek careers in these and the various other vitally necessary ancillary services.

The physician who commits himself to the discipline of a teacher and investigator in a modern school assumes a variety of tasks. As he grows older, he must take his place in the learned and professional societies, both national and international, which have as their objective the furthering of knowledge in his particular specialty. If he is in the clinical field, he will be interested in the welfare and expansion programmes of the hospitals with which he is associated. He will inevitably be sought as adviser or committee worker on the various community, provincial and national organizations, that are an essential feature of the present day social fabric of our nation.

I should indeed be remiss if, in speaking to a group of men, many of whom are interested in finance and administration, I failed to say a word about the financing of such a complex structure as the modern medical school. I referred earlier in my remarks to the close association of medical schools with universities. Indeed, since the publication of the Flexner report, no medical school in Canada has tried to exist except as an integral part of a university. The finances for the everyday necessities of a school—as indeed for all the divisions of a university—come from three sources: the fees paid by the students; private endowments; and government grants. The fees, high as they are in most medical schools, meet but from one-fifth to one-third of the annual budget. Income from private endowment in our own school provides approximately 5 per cent; income from fees approximately 30 per cent, while the remainder comes from the University, which, in turn, must look to provincial or federal sources. There is no separate grant from either provincial or federal funds towards the ordinary budget of the medical school. On the other hand, fairly liberal grants are available from various sources, for the prosecution of research. These sources include the National Research Council, national and provincial cancer organizations, national life insurance funds, private foundations, provincial and federal Departments of Health, and the Defence Research Board. Bricks and mortar, alterations, replacements—these must come from private funds or special government grants. Equipment of new buildings and laboratories may be supplied through provincial and federal grants, but when the buildings are completed, the heating, the lighting, the replacement of equipment, the staffing, all these represent increased obligations in the annual budget.

It may well be asked by business men, why a school should sell valuable service for less than it costs to produce it. In other words, if tuition fees produce only a fraction of the cost, why not raise the fees? These indeed are already so high that schools are beginning to wonder if certain bright young students coming from the families of artisans or farmers, may not be discouraged from enrolling in medicine. Annual fees in Canada vary from $450 to $600; in the U.S.A., from $600 to $900. The Americans' estimate of cost to produce a doctor is in excess of $13,000. The cost in Canada may be somewhat less, but I venture to say, even the American figure is less than that which it costs to produce a jet pilot, to say nothing of the machines which the pilot needs to make his skill effective. Other American figures indicate that medical colleges in that country absorb 30 per cent of the total budgets of the universities of which they are a part, although they enroll only 10 per cent of the total student population. In Toronto, the medical student population is under 10 per cent of the total enrollment, and it takes approximately 15 per cent of the total university academic budget. I can assure you, in Canada at least, the salaries of teachers in medical schools are not excessive, and indeed, the majority of the clinical teaching is carried on by practising specialists who devote a great deal of their time to teaching and public ward work for a nominal honorarium.

The American medical educator is not anxious to seek either state or federal aid, fearing the possibility that state support will result in some degree of state direction. There are currently two large funds in the United States, one seeking donations from large corporations, and the other from the profession, both funds being available to help meet the annual deficits of medical schools. These funds, of course, are exclusive of the many other sources for research and investigation.

My attention has been drawn recently to an advertisement in the New Yorker Magazine. This advertisement is sponsored by a large American corporation, and states that one out of every two colleges and universities in the United States is operating under a deficit. The company encourages college trained men who work for it to contribute to their college deficit fund, and promises to match these donations, dollar for dollar, up to a thousand dollars per year.

I think I can speak for Canadian schools; they do not fear any malign influence in money which comes from provincial or federal governments; they have not been embarrassed by such support; and although they welcome private endowments and private support for special projects, the ever-widening gap between income and expenditures can only be closed by solid and continuing government funds, if the schools are to carry out the functions which the public expects, and their tradition demands. The plan in Britain whereby grants are made on a five year basis through the university grants commission, has worked satisfactorily. After several years experience under both socialist and conservative administration, I have heard no murmur from British educators, of government interference with the sound basic principles of medical education in that country.

I have welcomed the opportunity to tell you something of this educational institution that is in your midst—an organization that inevitably through its work and influence reaches out and touches the every day lives of most of you at one time or another. Canada has already no small reputation for the quality of medical service available to its people, both in peace and war. The advances of modern medicine, the organization of society to bring good medicine to the nation—these are topics frequently before the public in the lay press. Canadians expect the best from their doctors and from the schools which train them.

The teaching of the art and modern science of medicine to a succession of young undergraduates; the sponsorship of modern research, ever reaching out for more space, more complex and expensive equipment, more skilled technical assistance; the planning of postgraduate education and specialist training in the light of an ever-widening field of knowledge and techniques; the encouragement of a spirit of leadership in its young teachers and investigators, and finally, creating a source of advice and sound judgment in community and national affairs that touch on the health of the people—these are the principal objectives of a medical school in this twentieth century.

It is a somewhat different conception to that of a school at the beginning of the century. That it is costly in comparison with those schools in the early 1900's, when even modest student fees were sufficient to balance the budget, there is no doubt. You, who can look back over the half century and consider but a few of the everyday facts in relation to the great strides towards prevention of disease, and the revolutionary advances in treatment, can best judge whether in this modern conception, the increased costs of medical education are justified.

I need hardly remind you of what the advances in medical research mean to the present generation. The statisticians tell us its effect on the population in the mass. Here are a few figures from British sources, and I am sure that Canadian figures would not differ greatly.

The expectation of life at the time of birth has increased in 50 years by 18½ years for boys, and 21 years for girls. The girl child of today who has reached a first birthday has a life expectancy of 71 years, and the boy 66 years. Diabetes and pernicious anaemia and many other diseases are under control. The common infections that were the major causes of illness in the early part of the century can for the most part be controlled, if not eradicated. On the one hand there are the great advances in preventive measures: typhoid and diphtheria are almost forgotten diseases in this generation of Canadians. And, on the other hand, there is the tremendous advance in the treatment of active disease by new drugs, by a better understanding of the underlying physiology, biochemistry and pathology. No longer is lobar pneumonia the winter scourge of the Canadian community. It is rare indeed to hear of death or even prolonged illness from blood poisoning. With the aid of new methods of anaesthesia, blood transfusion and other supportive measures, the surgeons have succeeded in attacking disease in areas of the body which were denied them at the turn of the century—the chest, the brain and the central nervous system, and the heart. There has been in evidence a new and encouraging approach to psychiatry and mental health. But all that is another story.

Modern medical schools produce the doctors who are versed in the new methods of diagnosis and treatment, the family doctors who will care for you and your children. Medical schools are the nurseries for doctors, but they also remain their professional homes — homes to which they return for renewal and revision of knowledge. They are by far the most important sources of the workers who engage in medical research. This golden age of medicine in the first half of the twentieth century is contemporaneous with the new concept and reorganization of medical schools. Who will say they are otherwise unrelated?

I have made some reference to the public interest in medical affairs. One's own interest turns quite as naturally at times to fields other than medicine—the ever increasing expenditures on entertainment and amusement, the increased demand for motor cars and the costs of new roads to carry them, the costs of primary and secondary education, the fantastic growth of our economy, with increasing demands for scientists, trained executives and professional men, and finally, in comparison, the relatively small expenditures on higher education.

This country will need trained leaders in every field in ever increasing numbers. The universities are the training grounds. It remains for the citizens to decide to what extent the institutions of higher learning, including the medical schools, shall continue to thrive and expand, unfettered by insecurity, and unhampered by financial stringency.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. Alexander Stark.

"OUR PARLIAMENT, ITS ORGANIZATION AND WORK"

An Address by

J. B. McGEACHY

of

The Globe and Mail, Toronto

Thursday, January 20th, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: We are very fortunate in having as our speaker today, a man who is well known as a radio commentator and is a writer of note—Mr. J. B. McGeachy, member of the editorial board of the Globe and Mail, Toronto.

Born in 1899 in Scotland, Mr. McGeachy came to Canada with his parents at the age of 14. He earned a B.A. at the University of Saskatchewan, then an M.A. in Modern History at the University of Toronto and took post-graduate work at Princeton University.

Mr. McGeachy has been in newspaper work since the age of 22. He was editor of the Saskatchewan Star-Phoenix from 1923 to 1927 and later correspondent for the Sifton newspapers in Ottawa (1930-31), in Washington (1931-34) and in London (1938-1940). In 1937 and 1938 he covered the Rowell-Sirois Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations, travelling Canada from Charlottetown to Vancouver.

Shortly after the outbreak of war in 1939 he joined the B.B.C. in London and was chief overseas commentator from 1940 to 1946, broadcasting daily talks on war and world politics to audiences in Commonwealth countries, the U.S.A., the Middle East, and other places.

Mr. McGeachy returned to Canada at the end of 1946 and joined the Globe and Mail editorial staff.

Most of you will have heard Mr. McGeachy speaking over the C.B.C. on Sunday nights in Weekend Review. He also broadcasts frequently in Now I Ask You, News Roundup, and Citizen's Forum, is a regular broadcaster on C.B.C.'s International Service, and has appeared on a number of T.V. programs.

MR. McGEACHY: I am honoured by your invitation to speak to you here today. After thinking about several possible topics, I decided that some reflections on Parliament, meaning the Canadian Parliament, might be in order. Parliament is in the news. It has just assembled for its 1955 session. This is its first year on the new salary scale—$10,000 a year or an outlay of $3,670,000 for the services of MP's and senators—and I suppose it's just possible that the Canadian public is looking for especially meritorious and energetic performances by both Houses.

But the best *immediate* reason for talking about Parliament is perhaps that in various ways the House of Commons is giving thought to improvements in its procedure. This strikes me as highly important and significant. I will come to the suggested reforms in a moment. First of all, let us look at Parliament in the setting of contemporary world politics.

All of us here were brought up to regard Parliament with profound respect, with awe and reverence if these emotions happened to be within our scope. Parliament is the palladium of our liberties. It is the grand assize of the nation. It is the true sovereign in our national affairs, as the great Dicey explained in his Law of the Constitution. And once upon a time, if not today, it was regarded as a sign of healthy ambition in a young man, rather than an eccentricity, if he aspired to be an MP.

For one reason or another, I think most of us would say the prestige of Parliament is no longer what it was. How many men of our time in Canada have won national fame as great parliamentary men? How often do we find our pulses quickened and the glories of our blood and state recalled by a rousing parliamentary debate? How true is it nowadays that Parliament is the guardian of our liberties and of the public purse?

Whatever answers you might be disposed to give, I think you would agree with me that the institution of Parliament, and the very word itself, does not stir and enchant us as it once did.

Perhaps this is only because none of us here today is in the first flush of youth; and we must beware of romanticizing the past. Here are two famous statements about the British Parliament, written in past centuries.

The first: "What is the thing called a parliament but a mock, composed of people that are only suffered to sit there because they are known to have no virtue?"

The second: "A Parliament, speaking through reporters to Buncombe and the 27 millions, mostly fools."

The first of these quotations dates from the Cromwellian period, when politics were highly inflammatory. The second, published in 1850, is from the pen of that old Scottish curmudgeon, Thomas Carlyle.

These voices from the past remind us that speaking ill of parliament is an ancient pastime and that our free institutions have always been open to criticism and even contumely. If we of 1955 are not wholly content with Parliament as we know it, we have precedents.

But it seems to me that, if Parliament is less honored and esteemed than it might be, we have more reason for concern than our forefathers had. Democracy, popular government, the parliamentary system, whatever you choose to call it, today has a formidable competitor, and this competitor has a philosophy, a body of doctrine, more persuasive—to many minds—than the apologies for tyranny that were current in previous centuries.

The believer in totalitarianism, whether Fascist or Communist, argues that government by talk is today quite obsolete because it cannot cope with the complexities of a modern industrial state. Indeed we find writers who are by no means totalitarians, of any stripe or color, indulging in melancholy reflections about the decay of parliament. We find members of our expensively educated youth viewing democratic politics with disdain and indifference. This is a more dangerous symptom than the vigorous denunciations of parliament the Victorians were accustomed to. And it is surely a disturbing fact that the countries where as few as 50 per cent of the eligible voters go to the polls are those with a long experience of self-government, like Canada; whereas the countries that can show an electorate 80 or even 90 per cent active are those that are just discovering democracy.

This contrast, I think, must shake any complacency we might feel about the perfection and immortality of our institution. In the great struggle for men's minds and allegiance that is now world-wide, the cold war or the ideological war as it is often called, we are apt to assume that *our* answer to the political needs of humanity is forever and inevitably right; indeed that our ancestors found the perfect formula when they invented parliament centuries ago. Perhaps they did, but nothing can be more certain than that this institution must adapt itself to changing circumstances if it is to survive and flourish. I suggest that this adaptation is a matter of urgent public concern, today and always.

Now if one takes the improvement of Parliament as a general topic, there are clearly two sub-headings under which one must organize one's ideas: personnel, to use modern jargon, and method.

I have not much to say on the first point. If we are to have better men (and women) in parliament, that must depend on the willingness of citizens of exceptional ability to run for office, and the capacity of the voters to recognize such candidates when they appear. For the encouragement of talented aspirants I suggest that boldness in speech and imaginative scope in the realm of ideas might be more effective, both in rousing interest and winning votes, than many politicians now apparently believe. I confess I was a little depressed to read recently, from a high political source, that the right prescription for getting into Parliament is to ring as many door-bells as possible.

It is quite necessary, of course, for a politician to nurse his constituency; but my recollection is that nurses do not do their most effective work by bell-ringing; nor even by the techniques of soothing.

However, it is about parliamentary methods that I wish to speak particularly. I am starting from the assumption, which is at least approximately true, that any Parliament of Canada will consist of patriotic, able and conscientious citizens anxious to do a useful job for the country. The question I am proposing for consideration is: How best can they use their time? How should they organize themselves to do the multifarious jobs that are presented to them every session at Ottawa? And these questions, as I said, are in the news because the House of Commons is thinking about certain reforms in its way of doing business.

To begin with, it seems to me, the House normally devotes far too much time to those general debates in which every topic is in order and speakers may range from the urgent need of new postoffices to the politics of Indo-China. The most conspicuous example is the debate on the speech from the throne which has been known to ramble over a month or longer. In the British House of Commons it lasts just one week or five debating days, by general consent and by arrangement between the party whips.

It is suggested that Canada adopt this Westminster practise, and, at the same time, reduce the permissible length of speeches to thirty minutes. Forty minutes, as you know, is now the time limit, unless the speaker is presenting a budget, replying to a budget as chief financial critic, moving or replying to a confidence motion.

In this matter of verbosity the example of Westminster is again instructive. There is no time limit on speeches there; I mean no time limit fixed by rule. But custom is just as potent. The British House of Commons—I speak from the experience of watching it through many afternoons and evenings—is very choosy and very easily bored. Any MP who detains the mother of parliaments for more than half an hour, except on a privileged occasion like those I mentioned, runs into emphatic expressions of disapproval. Members opposite him, and perhaps behind him as well, rustle papers, yawn, snore, walk out, heckle or otherwise indicate that they have had quite enough.

This salutary system gets results. Opening a recent volume of the British Hansard at random the other day, I lit upon a debate on a Treasury Bill, a major measure embodying important changes in purchase tax and death duties.

The Minister who moved second reading took fifty-one minutes. The chief critic following him took fifty-nine. Then eighteen back benchers spoke in exactly two hours and a half. Their average length was fifteen minutes. The briefest took only five, the most long-winded twenty-nine. Brisk debates like this happen regularly at Westminster. They are, so to speak, pre-arranged by the allocation of a definite number of hours to a question and then by the division of available time among MP's who want to speak.

This system can, it is true, be carried to absurdity, as in a neighbouring national capital not so far from here. A member of Congress may rise and say nothing but "I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks" and have a long speech, an undelivered speech, printed in the record of the day's proceedings. Later, offprints of the oration circulate by tens of thousands among the member's constituents.

This American practise has been frequently scoffed at. I wonder if it is any worse that the practise of those Canadian MP's who deliver, to empty benches, long addresses about the natural beauties and the urgent requirements of their home bailiwicks. Performances of this kind are not debate at all. They are what is known as bombinating in a vacuum. Fortunately they are less frequent than they used to be.

To sum up this point, it certainly appears to me that debates on the floor of the House of Commons, especially those which have no explicit subject, could be streamlined with advantage. But I think this end could be achieved much better by voluntary self-denial on the part of members than by a rigid rule. Did you notice that the other day an MP sat down after talking for only twenty minutes, a feat considered sufficiently odd to deserve a special Canadian Press dispatch from Ottawa. Perhaps if Mr. Speaker merely enforced the rule against reading speeches, there would be no need of either self-denial or clock-watching.

But what is the purpose of shortening debates? Certainly not, as I see it, to scamp the work of Pariament and enable members to get home earlier oftener. The point is, surely, that the really important work of the Commons is done in committees. A great extension of the committee system is needed at Ottawa; and it is particularly welcome news that a committee on estimates is to be set up at the present session.

The normal method of considering estimates, when you look at it closely, is inefficient to the point of being almost absurd. The committee of supply, which means the whole House, has been entrusted with the job in the past. That is to say, the details of four billion dollars worth of expenditure are scrutinized, or supposedly so, by 265 men sitting in a vast, ornate and reverberating chamber, an architectural masterpiece no doubt but a place suited for oratory rather than studying accounts. The whole House is further disqualified for the task because it cannot summon and examine such experts as deputy ministers, chiefs of staff, technicians and others.

A historian of the British Parliament, Kenneth Mackenzie, wrote: "The unsuitability of a body of more than 600 members for the scrutiny of the details of national expenditure must have been apparent from the beginning." By "the beginning" Mr. Mackenzie means the middle of the 18th century when parliamentary procedure began to take its present form. We are now in the middle of the twentieth. It took Britain a long time, indeed until 1920, to correct the deficiency noticed in 1750. It has taken Canada even longer.

Still, better late than never; and I think we should be pleased that the most important single parliamentary job, the examination of estimates, is at last to be assigned to a committee of the Canadian House of Commons. But once again I think we have something to learn from Westminster. Under British practise one large estimates committee divides itself at each session into about half a dozen subcommittees, each with a group of related departments as its field of inquiry. Canada, I suggest, should follow this method of having every item in the estimates studied. The current Ottawa proposal, that our committee should confine itself to a few departments not including the largest spenders, does not go far enough.

But there are, we should remember, two houses of parliament at Ottawa. There is the Senate as well as the House of Commons. Many unkind things are said about the Senate. There was a London story about the House of Lords which went like this. One noble lord said to another in Whitehall; "You know, I had the most extraordinary dream the other night. I dreamt I was speaking in the House and when I woke up, by Jove, I was." This anecdote originated in London. It was long ago transferred to Ottawa, with two senators as the dramatis personae.

I don't think it's fair to the elderly gentlemen of our Upper House. There is still a lot of vitality among them, as well as ability and public spirit. But I wish that Mr. St. Laurent would bring their house up to its full strength; and I wish the government would give them more work to do.

The British North America Act, as amended when Newfoundland came into confederation, says that there must be 102 senators; but for a long time there have been only about 80. It cannot be good for the Senate's morale to feel that the government thinks empty chairs just as valuable as chairs with senators in them.

There is sometimes, indeed, a reason for hesitation in filling a Senate vacancy. A long time ago Sir Wilfrid Laurier, with a Quebec senatorial appointment to make, could not decide between the merits of two claimants.

They were so nearly equal in vigor, wisdom and party service that Sir Wilfrid was unable to make up his mind. To solve the problem he named Monsieur Hyppolite Montplaisir, a deserving gentleman of 80, on the assumption that when, in due course, this Nestor among legislators had been gathered to his fathers, the close contest would have settled itself in one way or another.

Many years later, gentleman, M. Montplaisir died at the age of 103. Sir Wilfrid and the two rivals, by this time, had long ago gone to their long rest. A Senate seat is a great aid to longevity.

Mr. St. Laurent perhaps has similar conundrums before him as he surveys the yawning gap in the Senate's ranks; but I am sure that any one of us here could quickly find the answers for him if requested to do so. As for me, I would like to see him establish a new precedent by paying scant attention to political activity or affiliation and nominating men, and women, who have given distinguished service in other fields. I don't want to overdo the idea that Westminster sets a good example: it would take up a long time to produce a replica of the House of Lords even if that were a good idea. But it is no longer true that the House of Lords, in the words of Gilbert, makes no pretense to eminence or scholarship sublime. Its membership includes soldiers, churchmen, jurists, no professional poets (Tennyson, I think, was the last poet in the peerage) but scholars, teachers and scientists. And a debate in the Lords, though it may be attended by no more than forty or fifty out of about 800 members, can be an intellectual treat.

I suggest that the Canadian Senate should be fortified and enriched by the appointment of such distinguished non-political figures as appear, from time to time, in the British honors list. And I suggest that the improved Senate be then put to work at its constitutional job of revising and initiating legislation, holding inquiries into matters of public concern and illuminating great issues by independent debate. It is absurd, or so it seems to me, that Senators should be obliged to spend a large part of their time in studying the evidence in divorce cases; but that is a separate and a difficult controversy.

To sum up the argument I have tried to present: If parliament is to survive, except as an ornament, the talents of all its members, in both Houses, must be used with maximum efficiency in checking the operations of the executive. I think it important that parliament should survive, if we are to win, or even live through, the cold war.

I am going to wind up with a quotation from Edward R. Murrow, a name well known to you. Mr. Murrow was in London throughout the Second World War, broadcasting his reports and comments to a great audience in the United States. When he left England for home in 1946, he delivered a farewell broadcast to his British friends; and he said this:

"I doubt that the most important thing was Dunkirk or the Battle of Britain, El Alamein or Stalingrad. Not even the landings in Normandy or the great blows struck by British and American bombers. Historians may decide that any one of these events was decisive, but I am persuaded that the most important thing that happened in Briain was that this nation chose to win or lose under the established rules of parliamentary procedure. It feared Nazism but did not choose to imitate it. The government was given dictatorial power but this was used with moderation; and the House of Commons was ever vigilant. Do you remember that while London was being bombed in the daylight, the House devoted two days to discussing the conditions under which enemy aliens were detained on the Isle of Man? Though Britain might fall, there were to be no concentration camps here."

EMPIRE CLUB YEAR BOOK Galley 41

So spoke Mr. Murrow, a friend of Britain and the Commonwealth. Let us remember that liberty, the opposite of concentration camps, is our creed and that parliament, when it rises to its full height and glory, is indeed the custodian of our freedoms.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. John W. Griffin, a Past President of the Club.

"THE BRITISH ANSWER TO COMMUNISM"

An Address by

HORACE KING, M.P.

Labour Member for the Test Division of Southampton, England

Thursday, January 27th, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: Our speaker today, Dr. Horace King, Ph.D., M.P., is a man of wide experience and varied interests. A Labour Member of the British Parliament for the Test Division of Southampton, and an Executive Member of the Labour Party, he was a teacher and a headmaster, he has written a good deal of light music, has directed choirs and, during the last war, conducted a "V" concert party which not only entertained the troops but also raised money for the Prisoner of War Fund.

Dr. King has specialized in the history of Parliament, its traditions and its customs. He has lectured frequently on the subject and has published a short book called "Parliament and Freedom". He has also published books of selections from Macaulay and Homer, and has edited some of the best Sherlock Holmes stories.

Born in 1901 in Yorkshire, he won his way with scholarships from the village school at Stockton-on-Tees to the University of London where he graduated with First Class Honours and was awarded a Research Exhibition.

For 17 years Dr. King was head of the English Department at Taunton's School, Southampton (founded in 1760). From 1947 to 1950 he pioneered as headmaster of one of the new secondary schools established after the passing of the Education Act of 1944.

Since 1950 he has given his full attention to Parliament and to County Council work. His wife is very active in local government and was Mayor of Southampton in the Coronation year.

DR. KING: I count it a rare privilege to be invited to address so distinguished a Club.

I have been deeply impressed and deeply touched by the kind and warm welcome that I have received in these days everywhere that I have gone in Canada. I am tremendously impressed by the vitality and the genius and the character of the Canadian people, by the vision shown in Canada's new, upsurging industries of the 20th century.

I have admired the architecture of the great cities in which I have spoken. Canada is indeed *building* in every way . . . building economically and materially and spiritually.

If I may just say two things about Toronto . . . I haven't time to speak of the magnificence of its buildings, and how impressed I am by this great hotel. I was asked to bring from the Metropolitan Opera in New York, when I spoke there some days ago, the cordial greetings of members of the Opera, Mr. Rudolph, one of its conductors, and members of the Guild, because of the fraternity that has been fostered by the annual visit of the Metropolitan Opera to Toronto.

The other thing I would say is this: I was in the House of Commons on the day when we decided, in our own small way, to associate ourselves with the people of Toronto in the great hurricane disaster and I wish I could convey to you the emotion that moved the whole of the House of Commons, on both sides, as we attempted, in a very tiny way, to repay the mountains of gratitude that you built up in the hearts of the British people for the generous help that you poured over the sea to us, year after year, during the war and after the war. Indeed, wherever I go, I try to express the gratitude the British people feel to the people of Canada for the enormous services they rendered to the cause of freedom in the Second World War.

My own City of Southampton has intimate associations with thousands and thousands of Canadian boys who have passed through our port. Southampton was badly blitzed in the war . . . it was in poor shape at the end of it. We had the honour to be one of the Number One Targets chosen by Hitler. But Southampton is rebuilding, and I often think that the way in which Southampton, stricken deeply in the war years, is rebuilding itself, has refashioned its port as a great ocean terminal, has rebuilt the thousands of houses that were destroyed, has rebuilt the factories, and is playing its own part in the economic life of our country—all this is typical of the way in which Britain, after very grim post-war years is now beginning to turn the corner.

I have had the honour of visiting your Ottawa House of Parliament. Mr. Speaker invited me into his room. I met many of the members of all the political parties in the House of Commons, but the profoundest memory I shall carry away I think from Canada . . . certainly from Ottawa . . . is the moment that I spent in the Memorial Hall, and the moment that I spent in a Committee Room before that magnificent picture of Vimy Ridge.

Nobody in my country can ever forget what we owe to Canadian soldier boys in the two wars. The unity of purpose which bound together Canada and the rest of the British Commonwealth and our great Ally, the United States, in the war years, preserved Britain and preserved West Europe for Freedom.

I sometimes think we take too lightly the wonderful heritage of freedom. I think sometimes we take too lightly the sacrifices that the lads in your country and in Britain made to keep that freedom.

And in the years which followed the war, the same generous economic help from this side of the Atlantic preserved Western Europe, preserved Britain from economic disaster, and economic disaster might well have been followed by political disaster. And I would say that today that same unity of purpose, that ever strengthening of the bonds which bind together the free countries of the world, are about the most precious thing in the world, are the only hope of guaranteeing mankind against the disappearance of the life of free men from country after country. For if in one corner of the free world the lamp of freedom is extinguished, then sooner or later the lamps will go out in other parts.

Now, we differ in details of policy. As free people we will always differ. If the Soviet Foreign Secretary speaks at the United Nations and is followed by the Polish Foreign Secretary and the Czechoslovakian Foreign Secretary, their declarations are remarkably similar, not only in principle but even down to words and almost to punctuation marks. We don't want the unanimity of the graveyard. We want the right of free people freely to differ among each other. But let us express those differences wisely, temperately, loyally, remembering always that what binds us together are deep, common heritages, so infinitely greater than the details which divide us. Let us remember too, that over the garden wall at all times is an enemy who will exploit at any time differences between the free peoples, who will talk anti-American in Great Britain, will talk anti-British in America, and talk anti-both of us in France, and in Germany. I think that the significance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is not only military. I believe that circumstances are driving the free peoples of the world, not only into military defence, but into closer political economic and spiritual union.

Now, I don't apologize for saying that I am a Christian and that I believe that the cementing bonds of that great union is the Christian faith.

It is against that background that I would address a few remarks to you on the subject of my lecture. I hope I shan't speak too long. I always look for the Chairman's gavel.

You may know the story of the Chairman who got impatient when a speaker droned on at length, took a swipe at him and missed him. The poor fellow accidently struck another man on the platform and he dropped to the ground. As they stooped over him to render first aid, he said, "Hit me again . . . I can still hear him."

Dr. Sowby has just reminded me of the clergyman who said to his restive congregation, "I don't mind the congregation looking at their watches . . . I do object to them putting them to their ears and shaking them."

Gentlemen, I don't believe it is enough merely to abuse Communism, to say rude things about Communism. I don't believe it is enough to label everything that you don't like as being Communist. I sometimes think that the best way to appreciate what has happened in the Soviet Union is to glance back at the French Revolution which began with an upsurge against social injustice and then proceeded, in the words of one of its illustrious leaders, to "devour its own children."

It was followed by a time in which Napoleon trampled over the countries of Western Europe and, ironically, as he built up a French Empire, he did so under the slogan, "Liberté, Egalité et Fraternité". Peoples in the countries which he conquered at first thought that that they were being invaded by friendly, liberating armies. They were to be grimly disillusioned.

Well, something not dissimilar to that has happened inside the Soviet Union. One by one the original members of the Politbureau disappeared, were eliminated, a dictatorship took control of the destinies of the Russian people . . . a dictatorship stronger than the Czarist regime which it had supplanted, and it seems almost as though the old Russian policies, the old Russian Imperialist policies have been absorbed into the new Communist State.

At any rate, Russia has pursued policies in no way indistinguishable from those of old Imperialist Russia. The record is what matters, and if the slogans are still the slogan of "Workers of the World, Unite" and "Peace and the Brotherhood of Man", the simple fact remains that Russia is the one country in the years which followed the war which added millions and millions of acres of land and millions and millions of people to its territory.

While pursuing a nationalist imperialist policy, it has in every free country of the world Communists who will unconsciously or deliberately in those free countries support the ultimate aims of the Soviet Union.

I often distinguish in my own mind between the two kinds of Communists . . . the innocent Communist, the stooge, the simple working class chap who is "against the government", who is against some grievance, who won't believe facts which militate against his faith in the Soviet Union, and on the other hand the cynical exploiters of those people, who really know what they are doing, who work on grievances which undoubtedly exist, who undermine in the trade union movement, who drive wedges in the natural gaps between master and man, who seek to prevent the compromise between social forces inside free peoples, which is the only rational solution of difficulties—and all this not because they are interested in eliminating grievances . . . very often they would not want grievances to be remedied . . . they would rather that they remained as a perpetual irritant. For the Communist seeks to shake the faith of free people in free institutions.

If that is so, then I believe it is our duty in dealing with Communism to make what I consider to be a positive approach—not merely to label every grievance as a Communist grievance, but to use the weapons, the instruments of political democracy to remove the sources of irritation that exist in any community, to use the instruments which have come down to us to lead society away from the injustices that exist and nearer toward perfection. I don't believe we shall ever get perfection.

This positive approach demands, I think, good leadership on the part of the trade union movement. It is for that reason in Britain men like Arthur Deakin are the chief objects of attack by the Communist Party . . . the moderate trade unionist leader is always the victim of attacks by the Communist Party. It demands active trade union membership. It demands responsibility from those with whom the trade unions negotiate. It demands good local and national government.

We believe, certainly in Britain, that the most important social task of Democracy today is to prevent the recurrence of anything like the mass unemployment and poverty which seeped through the free world in the pre-war years. For poverty, unemployment, and the misery that comes with them, are a ripe field for the Communist exploiter to work on.

It demands education. A scientist, since I left Britain, speaking in London, has said "the alternatives are mass instruction or mass destruction."

We must explain patiently to our people just what Communism stands for. We must also explain to ourselves, we must explain to our young people, just how precious are the things that we take for granted, just how remarkable it is that I may say freely what I like as a free Briton, and to you as free Canadians, without looking over my shoulder to see whether I have said something which is dangerous, as in a police state.

As a matter of fact, if I may joke for a moment, the only time I was in a police state in Canada was when I spoke to Rotarians and because they knew my grandson liked Canadian Mounties, I found twelve toy Canadian Mounties on the table in front of me—a present for my grandson.

It demands too, an ever increasing realization that Democracy is the hardest form of government. Democracy doesn't mean sending a bunch of men to Parliament, sending a bunch of men to City Council, and then allowing them to deliver a new Jerusalem to citizens who think they have done their duty by voting once every two years, or once every four years. In passing, this is one of the features of your life in Canada that has impressed me greatly . . . the activity of Club after Club to which I have spoken . . . different kinds of clubs, voluntarily giving themselves to active Democracy, to active understanding of the problems which confront every responsible citizen in a free democracy.

Mr. President, if what I have said so far is true about the domestic scene, then it becomes infinitely more true when we turn to the depressed areas of the world, to the millions of people between the free world and the totalitarian world, for whose soul we are battling at the moment . . . the peoples of India, of Africa, of Southeast Asia, who are scratching a living from the surface of the earth, unable to accumulate capital resources which they might put into machinery and into modern agriculture, into discovering their raw materials, into industrializing their countries . . . parts of the world where the death rate among children is five, six, seven, eight times that among our own children.

I am one of those simple people who believe we shall never have built the kind of world God would want to see until all children all over the world have the same opportunity of surviving childhood, of building up healthy and happy bodies and developing whatever talents God gave them. I believe it is our Christian duty to reach out a helping hand to the under-developed peoples of the world. But even if it weren't a matter of righteousness, if we leave the middle world in its poverty and its hunger, how easily can people like that in their ignorance . . . ignorance is the breeding ground of Communism . . . how easy can these people be told that the cause of all their misery is the old conquering white races. "All you need is a revolution and everything in the garden will be lovely," says the Communist.

So the battle for the under-developed part of the world is part of the battle for the extension of the free world. With that in mind, it is worth remembering that that is just what the United Nations has been doing. We are sometimes inclined to think of the great failures of the United Nations. But we ought to remember the positive achievements of the United Nations . . . the great special agencies set up such as the Colombo Plan . . . which is possibly one of the key plans for winning this planet, in the long run, for freedom.

In my own country we were a great colonial power. The postwar history of Britain has been the history of a nation not only reaching the hand out to the subject races formerly under its control, but recognizing the legitimate national aspirations of all people in the world. We need today to think internationally, probably more than ever before . . . yet at this moment in world history, more than ever before the poorest people in the world, the longest subjugated peoples of the world are saying, Persia for the Persians, Egypt for the Egyptians, India for the Indians, and Pakistan for the Pakistani. That cry sounds strangely familiar to those of us who believe in Britain for the Britons and Canada for the Canadians.

I sometimes think that when history comes to be written . . . it is difficult to speak of history and judge it when you are living in it . . . when the long-term history of this part of the century comes to be written, possibly the most significant action of Britain in post-war years was the recognizing of India's right, and Pakistan's right, the right of the people of Ceylon, the right of the people of Burma, to independence. It may be that India and Pakistan are destined to play a great part in bridging the gap between Asia and the European and American races.

I know it is difficult to see this at the moment, when Nehru sits sometimes so much on the spikes on top of the Iron Curtain that when we hope that he will look both west and east, his eyes seem to be mostly Asiatic-ward. But we have got to remember that India is a free people. Every nation in the British Commonwealth makes its own policy. The policy of each individual member of the Commonweath takes its own slant, takes its own inclination from the kind of neighbours with which it is surrounded. India has to the north of her six hundred million Chinese people as neighbours with whom she must come to be on living terms.

I have time, Mr. President, to say only one word about defence. Just before I left Southampton I chaired a meeting for the American Consul, who in 1945 was a young assistant at San Francisco.

Wordsworth said of the French Revolution: "Bliss was it in that morning to be alive, but to be very young was very heaven." And those at San Francisco and all the wartime Allies said at San Francisco, "The United States, the Soviet Union, the members of the British Commonwealth, have underwritten world peace for our time, and indeed for all time."

It is a matter of cold fact that had the United States and the Soviet Union really underwritten peace, then world peace today would be certain and would be lasting.

Russia has thrown away oceans and mountains of good will in the years which have followed. We demobilized . . . you demobilized . . . the United States demobiized. I can remember Sir Winston in the House of Commons, in Opposition (and as terrible in opposition as in power!) attacking us for not demobilizing quickly enough. But Russia, maintaining her armed strength, increasing her armed strength, pursued intransigent policies, in every point of difference between us, using the veto, again and again and again. Then came the rape of Czechoslovakia, the Berlin air-lift, and aggression in Korea. And the free nations of the world, who wanted to do anything but rearm, who realize the waste of rearmament, who realize the jobs that the labour and the skill of man have waiting for them when we can get rid of the threat of war, were driven to rearm in self-defence, to build up their military power, and to integrate that military power in the North Atlantic Treaty Organizaion.

Of that I would only say this: we build that strength against nobody. We have no desire to wage aggressive war against the Soviet Union or anybody else. We build our strength to defend ourselves, to defend the free way of living, because we realize that only from a position of power is it possible to talk to the powers on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

It may be that the historic duty of our generation is to hold world peace. A tremendous responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the Foreign Secretaries of the world today. I watched Ernie Bevan die daily in the House of Commons, as he wore out his life in quest of peace.

I watched Sir Anthony Eden two years ago, and it seemed that he was going the same way. It is one of the happiest things, and all British people feel thankful, not only for the miraculous return to health of Sir Anthony Eden, but for the remarkable contribution that he is making in these days in the international councils of the world.

And I would say that Foreign Secretary Dulles, and your Secretary of External Affairs, Mr. Pearson, and Sir Anthony Eden, and indeed the foreign representatives of all the free peoples of the world . . . and indeed the foreign representatives of the countries across the Iron Curtain demand the prayers of every good thinking person on this planet. On our own freely chosen, freely elected diplomatic representatives, speaking for free people, pursuing a very difficult and dangerous and highly trying task, which demands the patience and the wisdom almost of angels, watching danger spots flare up, and danger spots recede . . . on these men is a responsibility almost beyond description. And the duty of democrats everywhere is to try to understand the issues and to accept our responsibilities as individual citizens of free communities.

It is in that spirit that I think ultimately we shall conquer. I am not a prophet . . . there is no prophet in the world that can look fifty years ahead . . . but I have a deep abiding faith in the inheritance of the free world, and I believe that if it can be wise and temperate without appeasement, resolutely saying No step further, but equally resolutely looking for the first signs of reason from the other side of the Iron Curtain, if we can only do that long enough, all will be well for mankind. If we can prevent the shooting war from breaking out for long enough . . . and everybody in Britain and indeed everybody who thinks at all in any country of the world realizes that the Third World War would be third world tragedy beyond description . . . it may be that our duty is just to hold on . . . if we can only hold on long enough I believe that dictatorships contain the seed of their own destruction and that some day the people of the Soviet Union and the people of China, the people of Poland, the people of Czechoslovakia, and the people of Bulgaria and Hungary will themselves reach forward to the free way and live freely with their brothers on our side of the Iron Curtain.

Gentlemen, it has been a great honour to be here today and I am very, very proud to have been asked, not only to speak here, but to speak before representatives of almost every walk of life in Canada. I count this last two weeks among the most precious of my life.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Dr. C. C. Goldring, the Second Vice-President of the Club.

"THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY"

An Address by

THE HONOURABLE LIONEL CHEVRIER

Chairman, St. Lawrence Seaway Authority

Thursday, February 3rd, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: In view of the importance of the St. Lawrence Seaway to our country, our province and our own city, we are fortunate in having as our speaker today, a man who has, over the years, been one of the chief protagonists of the Seaway project and who has an extensive knowledge of its many ramifications—the Honourable Lionel Chevrier, Q.C.

A fluent speaker in both English and French and an able administrator, the Honourable Mr. Chevrier relinquished his portfolio as Minister of Transport in the federal government on July 1, 1954 to accept the chairmanship of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority.

Born in Cornwall in 1903, Mr. Chevrier graduated from the University of Ottawa in 1924, after winning medals in debating and chemistry, then attended Osgoode Hall and was called to the Bar of Ontario in 1928.

Elected to Parliament in 1935 at the age of 32 for the constituency of Stormont, Mr. Chevrier was 10 years later appointed Minister of Transport, being one of the youngest men ever to be given a portfolio in the Canadian cabinet.

MR. CHEVRIER: I regard it as distinct honour to be here as the guest of the Empire Club. The compliment paid me by the invitation to speak to this distinguished audience is one I deeply appreciate.

My subject is the St. Lawrence Seaway. It is not a new one. It has had a long and chequered career. Few subjects have received such careful and varied attention from both the Canadian and American Governments. Recently it has taken on new impetus because of Canadian initiative and Canadian action.

This subject has been studied from many aspects. Today I should like to consider it from three angles—

1. The Treaty Rights and obligations upon the St. Lawrence.
2. The works and facilities to be constructed thereon.
3. Their effect upon the economy.

What rights have the citizens of the United States on the St. Lawrence River?

These rights seem to have been established by treaty over a period of years, and I should like to deal with these briefly.

The St. Lawrence River divides itself into five sections, one of these is known as the International Rapids Section. The boundary line separating Canada from the United States follows the 45th parallel of latitude until it strikes the St. Lawrence River at a point east of the City of Cornwall and then for a distance of 112 miles follows the middle of the stream until it strikes the foot of Lake Ontario. This boundary line was fixed by the Treaty of 1783 ending the War of American Independence. Strangely enough when this treaty was signed Canada owned a preponderant number of islands in the Long Sault area. Following the War of 1812 the British Commissioners were anxious to have what was then called Grand Island, now called Wolfe Island, immediately opposite the Harbour of Kingston, and asked that it be transferred to Canada.

Kingston, of course, was the chief naval base on the lakes, a possible capital, and in fact eventually a capital and it was felt undesirable to have a foreign country owning an island a mile or two out in the bay, so Wolfe Island was traded for certain other islands. That is the reason why the United States owns a greater number of islands at the Long Sault.

Next came the Ashburton-Webster Treaty of 1842, which has one brief reference to the River St. Lawrence, which reads as follows: "It is further agreed that the channels in the River St. Lawrence on both sides of the Long Sault Islands and Barnhart Island . . . shall be equally free and open to the ships, vessels and boats of both parties". That clause was put in because the navigable channels in the Long Sault and in the River St. Clair were on the United States side, and while there was no likelihood that the use of them by Canadian vessels would be barred, it was desirable to have an explicit understanding that they should be open. A similar provision covering the rights of American vessels in the Detroit River and at Bois Blanc Island, where the chief channels are on the Canadian side, was inserted.

Then in 1871 came the Treaty of Washington. It provided by Article 26 that "The navigation of the River St. Lawrence ascending and descending from the 45th parallel of latitude, where it ceases to form the boundary between the two countries, from, to and into the sea, shall forever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws and regulations of Great Britain or of the Dominion of Canada, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation". This is one of the most important provisions of the treaty, that the navigation of the River St. Lawrence ascending and descending from Cornwall to the sea shall forever be open to the citizens of the United States.

In 1909 came the Boundary Waters Treaty, which established the International Joint Commission to deal with matters relating to those waters of common concern to Canada and the United States which either flow along or across the boundary. As a result, questions affecting the level of these waters are referred to the Joint Commission.

In 1932 came the St. Lawrence Deep Waterway Treaty signed at Washington. It provided for the construction of a 27 foot waterway from the head of the Great Lakes to Montreal; for a combined power-navigation project in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River enabling the development under a two-stage scheme for 2,200,000 horse-power evenly divided between Canada and the United States.

Under this treaty power was to be developed in two stages, one at Long Sault near Cornwall, the other at Crysler Island near Morrisburg. There was also to be two canals, one on the American side at Barnhart Island, the other on the Canadian side at Crysler Island. This treaty was defeated in the Senate of the United States.

In 1941 Canada signed another agreement with the United States, this one known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Agreement of 1941. It included substantially the same features as the 1932 St. Lawrence Deep Waterway Treaty. It provided for the construction of the remaining links of a 27 foot waterway from the head of the Great Lakes to Montreal; for a combined power-navigation scheme in the International section of the St. Lawrence River; the power to be developed in a controlled single stage project yielding 2,200,000 horse-power divided between the two countries.

According to this agreement power was to be developed under one head at the Long Sault under a plan known as the 238-242 single stage control scheme. The two canals under this scheme in the International section were both in United States territory. This agreement, after eleven years of discussion was neither approved nor rejected by the Congress of the United States.

Following agreement with United States administration, a joint application was made by Canada and the United States in June of 1952 to the International Joint Commission for the development of power in the International Rapids section, and Canada agreed to build all the navigation facilities on the Canadian side from Montreal to Lake Erie. While the application for power was approved in October, 1952 by the International Joint Commission, the issuance of a licence by the Federal Power Commission to the Power Authority of the State of New York was challenged and it was only on June 7, 1954 that the final objections to this licence were overcome in the courts of the United States.

Meanwhile, the Congress of the United States decided to participate in the Seaway. Early in 1954 it passed an Act known as the Wiley-Dondero Act, instructing and directing an American agency known as The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, to build all the navigation facilities in the International Rapids section of the river in American territory.

So here was the situation when negotiations took place between the two governments in July of last year. Canada had taken its decision in 1951 and enacted legislation to build facilities and secured the agreement of the United States to this end in 1952. The Wiley-Dondero Act directing the United States to build at Barnhart and Iroquois was passed in 1954. The result: Canada agreed to refrain from building at Barnhart now, but it continuing with all the works including Iroquois in accordance with legislation now on its books for three years. In fact, work is now underway on several of the projects including Iroquois.

The present position is, therefore, that Ontario and New York State are proceeding to develop power through their representative agencies. This could not have been possible without American concurrence. In so far as navigation is concerned, the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority is proceeding to build at Lachine and on the Canadian side at Iroquois. Now how does this compare with what took place under earlier treaties?

Under the 1932 treaty the navigation canal passing Crysler Island Dam was to be built in Canadian territory and that passing the Barnhart Island Dam, in United States territory. In the 1941 agreement the navigation canals passing the Crysler Island Dam and the Barnhart Island Dam were both to be constructed in United States territory. Our position today is that we are building at Iroquois; we hope the Americans will decide not to build there, and we hope the day will come when it will be possible to build 27 foot facilities opposite Barnhart Island on the Canadian side.

The works or facilities to be constructed.

Before dealing with the project itself it is well to define certain terms.

What do we understand by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway as now envisaged?

It is a 27 foot channel extending from the port of Montreal to Lake Erie which will allow 25 foot draught ships to come through the waterway and conversely to permit Lake carriers to come down to the Port of Montreal. Coupled with this is a joint development of power in the International Rapids section of the river by Ontario and New York State in the amount of 2,200,000 horsepower; one-half of which belongs to the United States, the other half to Canada.

What is the Great-Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin?

It is a vast drainage system covering an area of 678,000 square miles, 493,000 of which are in Canada and 185,000 in the United States. Over this drainage system is an average annual precipitation of over 30 inches. It includes Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron, St. Clair, Erie and Ontario, together with all the tributory rivers and streams, the most important of which are the St. Lawrence, the Ottawa, the St. Maurice and the Saguenay Rivers. You will, therefore, immediately appreciate the economic significance of this vast drainage basin comprising a potential waterway, together with a potential reservoir of white power in the area of Canada where there is no coal or black power.

What does the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway consist of?

The Seaway may be described as consisting of five steps. These five steps are liabilities as far as navigation is concerned, in that facilities must be provided to enable vessels to pass them. But they are also great assets, in that they offer more than 10,000,000 horse-power of electrical energy for the harnessing. The five steps are:

1. The St. Mary's River between Lakes Superior and Huron, a drop of 21 feet;
2. The St. Clair-Detroit passage joining Lakes Huron and Erie, a drop of 8 feet;
3. The Niagara River from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario, a tremendous drop of 326 feet;
4. The Upper St. Lawrence River from Lake Ontario, to Montreal, another great drop of 225 feet;
5. Montreal to the sea, a drop of 20 feet.

These five steps will develop approximately 10,800,000 horse-power as follows:

Niagara	5,400,000 h.p.
International Rapids	2,200,000 h.p.
Soulanges (Beauharnois)	2,000,000 h.p.
Lachine	1,200,000 h.p.

All of this power is Canadian except 2,700,000 horse-power at Niagara and 1,100,000 horse-power in the International Rapids section.

What is the nature of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence navigation as we know it today?

As the navigation system is presently constituted it divides itself into four sections as follows:

1. From the Gulf of St. Lawrence to Montreal, a distance of 1,000 miles, with controlling navigation channels of 35 feet in depth;
2. From Montreal to Lake Ontario, a distance of 180 miles with controlling navigation channels of 14 feet;
3. From Lake Ontario to Lake Erie, a distance of 200 miles with controlling navigation channels of 25 feet;
4. From Lake Erie to the head of the Lakes, a distance of 970 miles with controlling navigation channels of 25 feet downbound and 21 feet upbound.

Now then, what additional or new works are proposed?

Most of the new works would be in the second section I have just mentioned, namely, the St. Lawrence River from Prescott to Montreal. This is known as the upper St. Lawrence River and falls naturally into five divisions: The Thousand Islands, the International Rapids, the Lake

St. Francis, the Soulanges and the Lachine sections, and major works are necessary in three of the five. The first is the International Rapids section. It is here that the most extensive and costly works are required. The plan agreed upon by the engineers is the 238-242 single stage control scheme. It is the plan approved by the International Joint Commission and its main features are as follows:

1. An upper control dam near Iroquois
2. A main dam and powerhouse near Cornwall
3. Side canals past each of the two dams
4. Dykes where necessary to retain the pool level
5. Channel enlargement to reduce current velocities in some stretches
6. Relocation of some railways and highways
7. Rehabilitation of the communities along the front.

The second of the three sections is Soulanges. Here the basic power development already exists at Beauharnois and the power canal incorporates a 27 foot canal. Little more is required than the provision of a short side canal with two twin locks in flight to pass vessels from the power canal to Lake St. Louis. Thirdly, in the Lachine section, the minimum development will be for navigation alone. This would involve considerable channel enlargement and a ten mile canal with two locks. But a large-scale power development is possible in this section too. The Provincial Government has given no indication that it intends to develop power jointly with the construction of navigational facilities, so the Seaway Authority is proceeding on the basis of a navigation development alone. That covers the three sections of the St. Lawrence River where major works are required. Comparative minor channel work is required in the two remaining sections, the Thousand Islands and Lake St. Francis in order to achieve Seaway standards for navigation.

What effect will these facilities have upon the economy of Canada?

Studies made by Engineeers, economists and statisticians indicate that the benefits flowing from the improved transportation facilities and the power development are staggering.

The first and most important will be the removal of the 112 mile - 14 foot bottleneck between Lake Ontario and Montreal which will permit the extension of the peculiar characteristics of the Great Lakes navigation system. The potentialities of this area which have been restricted in the last 50 years are bound to afford opportunities for industrial development because of the availability of 27 foot navigation.

The Seaway will open up a much larger market for ore from Labrador than could otherwise be reached. This mining development is going ahead now with the initial goal of shipping 10,000,000 tons a year. But with the Seaway and after paying any likely level of tolls, this ore could compete in virtually the whole Great Lakes market. The mining interests see an immediate sale of at least 20,000,000 tons a year, just double the present goal and a growing market thereafter.

Another Seaway benefit would be the savings in the costs of transporting grain, flour, coal, machinery and other commodities. The savings would be great enough if it were just a matter of allowing cargoes to move in large and economic vessels throughout the Seaway without trans-shipment. It promises to be all the greater because upbound vessels with ore and other cargoes will find it of advantage to carry grain and other downbound cargoes making for a greater economy in the use of the vessels. It is estimated that this saving will amount to $30,000,000 a year.

Completion of the Seaway will bring benefits from coast to coast. Very few projects in our history can make such a claim.

I have no need to emphasize to a group such as yours what the project will mean to southern Ontario and particularly south-eastern Ontario. The importance of the new reserve of low-cost power can hardly be over-emphasized. Much of the energy generated may come to be used in the eastern part of the province near the development site. But at the same time the new facilities will be able to take some of the load now falling on other power sources, and hence release ample reserve supplies throughout the southern hydro system. This project will be an important factor in inducing continued industrial growth in the area.

Toronto and other communities on the waterfront will not only benefit from the improved power position, they will have the advantage of access to new water routes offering low-cost transportation. These two factors are important in determining the location of many industrial plants, and I am sure that in combination they spell a great future for your city.

The benefits to be derived from navigation and power have ramifications which are not only regional, but national and international. It has been estimated that the Seaway will bring savings to the Canadian economy of somewhere in the neighbourhood of $100,000,000 annually.

Look at the map of North America and you will see that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway is almost in the centre of the continent. This region will be opened up to the commerce of the world. When one realizes that more yearly tonnage passes through the locks at the Sault in the Upper Lakes region than through the Panama and Suez canals put together, one gets some idea of the traffic likely to go through when the project is completed.

The prosperity of Canada is to a large extent dependent upon industrial production and the latter is impossible without modern transportation facilities and without power. Hence the benefits of this great project to both Canada and the United States are incalculable.

After many years of hesitation Canada and the United States have decided to act together on the Seaway. This action will enure to the benefit of both countries. Together we shall go on to better things.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. Donald Jupp, the Third Vice-President of the Club.

An Address by

MRS. OGDEN REID

Chairman of the Board
New York Herald Tribune

Thursday, February 10th, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: Our speaker today — Mrs. Ogden Mills Reid—and her publication—The New York Herald Tribune—are well and favourably known to Canadian and United States audiences.

A dynamo in New York newspaper circles for 37 years, and long recognized as the First Lady of U.S. journalism, Helen Rogers Reid (as she is better known) was recently rated as one of the world's ten most outstanding women.

Born in Appleton, Wisconsin, the youngest in a family of eleven, Mrs. Reid entered Barnard College at the age of 16, worked in the Treasurer's office to help put herself through college, majored in Greek and Biology and graduated in 1903. She became a Barnard Trustee in 1914 and has been chairman of the Board of Trustees since 1947.

Upon graduation she took the position of secretary to Mrs. Whitelaw Reid two years before Mr. Whitelaw Reid became Ambassador to the Court of St. James. Eight years later she married Ogden Reid who succeeded his father as editor of the New York Herald Tribune.

On November 1, 1918, her two sons being of school age, Mrs. Reid joined the Herald Tribune (then the New York Tribune) as a member of the advertising staff—originally as a solicitor, later as director of the advertising department. In 1922 she became vice-president and, on the death of Mr. Ogden Reid in 1947, she became president. In 1953 she was made chairman of the board.

Her older son, Whitelaw Reid, is now President and editor, and her other son, Ogden Rogers Reid, is vice-president and president of the European edition.

Mrs. Reid tells me that one of the highlights of her life was receiving the honorary degree of LL.D. from the University of Toronto in 1947. Mrs. Reid holds honorary degrees from 14 universities or colleges in the United States.

MRS. REID: To many of us living in the States, Canadians seem to have had a magic wand in achieving economic wonders and we are wide-eyed with admiration for your widespread prosperity. Instead of a willow wand for finding water you have had the scientific variety of wand that discovers oil, natural gas and the most precious of minerals. Also, your particular kind of storybook record appears to be firmly based on solid ground or embedded in rock under the ground. After the war years and the long period of restrictions, which you gallantly accepted, you have emerged with success so great that it has made news for the whole world. Undoubtedly, too, you have only scratched the surface of resources between Toronto and the Arctic Ocean. The fact that your riches stem from scientific discoveries and adventurous exploration gives promise of unknown progress ahead. Even without a crystal ball it is almost easy to foresee an exciting future.

We are living, of course, in what is called the electronic and atomic age but presumably we have experienced only the first small sample of what that means. When Faraday produced the first electric current—130 years ago—he did not dream of the amazing future that he had made possible with the use of electricity. Marconi also had no thought of broadcasting, television or radar when he sent the first faint wireless signal through the air fifty years ago. Today, with the basic tools these men provided startling events are taking place far more rapidly. A decade produces miracles and even the span of five years turns dreams into reality. The General Electric Company has stated in connection with electronic and atomic energy "that we expect to produce more in the next 10 years than in all the previous 75 years of our existence."

Unfortunately, it took a war to discover the power of the atom, and people are having a difficult time in adjusting themselves psychologically to its capacity for good as well as evil. They are haunted by its birth for destructive purposes and they still have no concept of its life-giving qualities, although one noble characteristic of the atom may be the fact that its sheer power for total destruction can also be the power for ending wars, providing trigger-happy people do not set off a fuse. Scientific minds are only *beginning* to understand and master the contents and character of the atmosphere in which we live but progress takes place when the brain of man explores and harnesses elements that have *always* existed — instead of fighting them. Startling results may come from a genuine partnership between brains and the forces of nature itself—forces that we have taken for granted in almost a mythological way rather than as God-given assets for men to utilize when their mind matures. Man has lived with the atoms since his beginning but only recently has be found that he can split and organize them to benefit civilization. In addition to their usefulness in medicine, they may be made as routine an asset to human living through their conversion to electricity as water is—or at least water on this continent. In other words, it is possible that electric power developed from *nuclear* fuels can become so much cheaper than electricity made today from *fossil* fuels—namely, coal and oil—that we may be able to buy electricity for housekeeping and industry at a rate so low that it will not have to be metered. We will merely pay a moderate fixed price per year. Admiral Strauss, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission in Washington, has stated that in his opinion this will happen within the lifetime at least of our grandchildren, and perhaps sooner.

Another resource in nature which has scarcely been touched is solar energy. We think of the sun more or less as a charitable institution that makes daytime possible, that helps food to grow and that generally adds to the joys of life, although we know that, like the atom, it can also kill. But its real power for other types of service has never been developed. One illustration which you have probably heard about is the solar cooking stove. It is still in the process of development but it has infinite possibilities for tropical countries. A friend of mine, Dr. Maria Telkes, formerly of M.I.T., who is now doing research work in connection with the stove at New York University will some day make it available for mass manufacture so that it can be used with dramatic success in India, Africa or any place where there is a wealth of sunshine and no fuel. Last Friday she cooked a meal in her New York laboratory when the temperature outside was below zero and she was able, with half an hour of sun, to produce heat of 425 degrees in her stove. Mr. Nehru, I am told, is greatly interested in what an appliance of this kind can do for India when it can be produced in quantities at a low price. Five dollars is probably the outside figure. Perhaps the heart of Mr. Nehru will warm towards us more if we can help with warming food for his people!

The same scientist of solar stove fame heated successfully a home in Massachusetts which you undoubtedly read about in your papers several years ago. She believes it can be equally well air-cooled in summer with the use of solar storage batteries.

Another great value that solar energy can contribute to the world is in the distilling of salt water. Small units have been successfully developed for life rafts and there are two plants in operation—one in Massachusetts and one in San Francisco Bay operated by the University of California—but nothing has been tried on a large scale. The experiments, however, have revealed that any amount of ocean water can be separated from the salt and used for irrigation in desert areas or wherever more water is needed. Even polluted water can be purified. The fear of losing a supply of water *essential* for the increasing population of our earth can therefore be eliminated and as soon as more capital is available to put into the project of *working* with solar energy, new fortunes may well be made.

There are also by-product assets in the salt itself and other minerals mixed with it.

A third door to an exciting future is the sky. In the defense picture Canada has specialized in the building of a superb jet engine, the Orenda, as well as the CF100 interceptor fighting plane, and your Defense Research Board is developing guided missiles—all of which can play an important part in peacetime activity. The point is that every defense development *now* can in future contribute to air service for better living in the same way as atomic energy. In the January issue of "Fortune" General David Sarnoff says that guided misslies will be able to transport mail and freight over great distances—transcontinental and transoceanic—and will be guided into terminal hangars within minutes after their take-off.

I have recently seen an extraordinary short picture that is to be given general distribution and will be certain to reach Canada before long. It is called The Supersonic Age and it dramatizes in a breathtaking way new plane models that have been produced by English designers. Whether Canada or the United States has done as much in this creative line I do not know but there *has* been news of your super-secret "Project Y"—a disc-shaped fighter plane that is reportedly capable of attaining a speed of 1,500 miles per hour from a vertical take-off.

Along with supersonic planes we have another phenomenon in our midst that cannot be laughed off—flying saucers. Many people have relegated this subject to the area of the ridiculous but certain unexplainable facts remain and a carefully screened net owes much to the testimony of Canadians.

Since 1900 there have been thousands of recorded cases of objects in the sky which have had the characteristics of meteors or atmospheric peculiarities. Too many hard-headed pilots or scientists on the ground have seen substantial objects which were apparently being flown by direction from within the objects and with the ability to change their course abruptly in a way unknown to our aviation experts. (Experience of airline pilot) Serious and secret studies are, I understand, being made by various governments, including that of Great Britain, the United States and no doubt Canada. Meanwhile it is estimated that approximately 10% of the flying saucer observations made by reliable persons are beyond understanding and they give substance to a phenomenon about which we need to know more. Trustworthy people who have placed their evidence on government record are convinced that the saucer objects are of interplanetary origin with Venus as the likely planet. In France, which, except for Italy, has been the origin of more recent "flying saucer" reports than any other nation in Europe, the magazine "Express" has offered a reward of 10,000,000 francs (about $28,570) to the first person to bring a visitor from outer space into its offices. Meanwhile, this interplanetary idea can have a healthy influence on the egocentric people who believe that the earth—with a sun, moon and stars set up for its special benefit—is the sum total of everything plus, of course, Heaven and Hell. We may come ultimately to knowledge that God created a universe far vaster and more complicated than our earth-centered imaginations have dreamed of.

Canada and the United States have had so many common interests that the result has been a relationship spectacular among other neighbor nations of the world but perhaps there are still unknown opportunities for our scientists and economists to work together in a way that will produce a new kind of leadership in the world. Toronto has certainly become a dynamic engine in all that is developing in Canada and scientific engineers with mutual confidence on both sides of our dividing line may unite us even more strongly. Meanwhile, we share the possibilities of unknown drama during the next 20 years in the three fields I have mentioned—atomic energy, solar energy and the sky.

In the area of government, Sir Winston Churchill made the statement a number of years ago that Canada is the linchpin between the British Commonwealth and the United States. This is a meaningful metaphor but in addition to your being a static force in terms of iron or steel you are a creative one in exploring new ideas. You have also contributed many human values to our country. It was stirring news to many and very moving when George McCullagh, the late owner of your great paper, the Globe and Mail, made the statement in a New York speech that 48,000 Canadians fought in the armies of the North in our Civil War and that 18,000 gave their lives for the preservation of the Union. This terrific fact in the history of our two countries had not been known to me and is I believe still unknown to most of our citizens. Mr. McCullagh was a great unofficial ambassador from your country to ours and his powers for developing understanding were unequalled. His tragic death was mourned as a loss to all North America.

Another great act of friendliness as well as economic wisdom on the part of your country took place when it changed its currency from pounds and pence to dollars and cents to facilitate trade between our two nations. This undoubtedly has been a big factor in the enormous investment that Americans have made in Canadian enterprises. Ten years ago it was $4,000,000,000—today it is well over five billion. Nothing perhaps makes for closer ties between people than mutually successful investments and I hope we shall continue to put our money together into important developments, such as the St. Lawrence Seaway and the uranium fields.

Now if you will forgive me I would like to point to one cause on which our two countries have differed and on which I have never been able to understand the thinking of your leaders, even as distinguished a one as your Governor General, The Right Hon. Vincent Massey. In addition to your country's basic relation to Great Britain and your vital part in the Commonwealth of Nations, you occupy a large space in the Western Hemisphere—almost 25%—and I cannot believe that your loyalty overseas interferes in the least with your becoming a part of the Organization of American States for the preservation of peace and other standards of fair play throughout North, South and Central America. It would be a wonderful evolution if this kind of unity in the western world could take place. There could also be additional strength from another Commonwealth Federation made up of Caribbean islands according to a plan recently announced by the British government. Even Sir Winston Churchill has now gone on record in favor of England's cooperation with Europe as a *regional responsibility* in addition to its basic leadership in the Commonwealth.

Perhaps all of you in this room disagree with the idea but I trust that you will at least keep open minds and give it some renewed thinking. Through your part in the Commonwealth you helped to create a prototype of the United Nations, and the success of an Empire's evolution into an organization of free nations gave inspiration to the whole world but I hope the day will come when Canada will wish to give support to its own *regional* area as well as to the Commonwealth and the United Nations.

There are no words for expressing my appreciation of your hospitality today. I feel, however, that it is not so much an honor to myself as to the important field of journalism in which I have had the chance to work. Your own experience in reading and being responsible for the excellent newspapers of Canada enables you to know what they mean to the high purposes of a nation. In spite of some differences in the news standards among them, the world owes a great debt to the freedom of the press in North America. Except for papers in England, it has performed a service beyond that of any other part of the world. Through your having furnished the basic ingredient for most newspapers in the United States, as well as all of your own, you have made a great contribution to this democratic process. Newsprint is your largest export and its importance to good relations between our two countries cannot be over estimated. It is a special tie and a special responsibility.

There are many links in our chain of mutual understanding—our common belief in a democratic form of government, our security requirements against a common enemy, our love of new frontiers—but the biggest potential for the future may come from the kind of co-operation in which our best scientific minds will master and draft for work the natural resources—not only those within the ground, but also those above the ground, in the air around us, in the sea and in the far reaches of the sky. This horizon has no limits for Canada and the United States and it can become a continuing news story for all time.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. John Griffin, a Past President of the Club.

"THE CHANGING COMMONWEALTH"

An Address by

DR. ALEXANDER FLECK

Chairman of Imperial Chemical Industries Limited

Thursday, February 17th, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: We are honoured to have as our speaker today—Dr. Alexander Fleck, D.Sc., LL.D.—who is the leading figure in one of the world's largest industrial empires. He is chairman of the board of the huge Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd., which has subsidiaries all over the free world, and is a director of its Canadian subsidiary, Canadian Industries (1954) Ltd.

Dr. Fleck's own career is a striking illustration of what can be accomplished, by anyone with ability and the willingness to work, under the free enterprise system which our British Commonwealth countries are fighting so hard to maintain.

Born in Glasgow in 1899, Dr. Fleck started his working life as a "lab" boy at Glasgow University—that is as one of the boys who did the manual work, the sweeping and washing up, in the laboratories. His desire to learn won him the opportunity, after three years, to attend classes as a full time student. By great determination he gained a chemistry degree at 22 and an appointment on the university's teaching staff.

By 1913, at 24, he had his own research laboratory as Physical Chemist to the Glasgow and West of Scotland Radium Committee.

The vast and high speed expansion of the British chemical industry during World War I drew Dr. Fleck into the Castner-Kellner Alkali Co., a subsidiary of Brunner, Mond & Co., which was one of the four big chemical groups which merged in 1926 to form Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd.

Dr. Fleck rose rapidly in the new organization due partly to the company's own expansion, due partly to its policy of decentralization, but in large part due to his own ability.

Appointed a director of the main company in 1944, he was one of the company's Deputy Chairmen from 1951 until his appointment as Chairman in June 1953. Since then he has visited the company's interests in Canada, the U.S.A., India, Pakistan, Ceylon, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand so that he speaks to us from first hand knowledge on "The Changing Commonwealth".

DR. FLECK: I deem it a great honour to be asked to address your Club today. When I reflect upon the proud procession of distinguished speakers who have preceded me and whom I am asked to follow, I become even more conscious of the extent of the honour which you do me. Furthermore, the aims of your Club—"the strengthening of the bonds of unity within the Empire"—correspond so closely to my own that I cannot regard myself entirely as a stranger in your midst—guest though I be.

When my predecessor as Chairman of Imperial Chemical Industries, Mr. John Rogers, had the honour to be your guest some two years ago, he chose to comment upon the general relationship—economic, political and cultural—between Canada and Great Britain. Today I should like to move on to a wider plain and to discuss the changing character of the British Commonwealth as it appears to a contemporary.

You will appreciate that what I have to say are only my personal impressions and is certainly not the last word on the subject. But in the last year I have had the good fortune to travel, in my capacity as Chairman of I.C.I., to many parts of the Commonwealth which I had not previously had the occasion to visit—India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Singapore, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa—as well as revisiting Canada to which I am no stranger. These visits have given me a rare opportunity of seeing the post-war Commonwealth at work. Naturally, my visits have been short and have tended to revolve round the business of my own company, although they have been by no means limited in that way.

During my life, the changes which have taken place in the form and in the character—indeed even in the spirit—of the British Commonwealth have been immense. When I was a small boy—back in the last century—it was the British Empire in which we were taught to believe. In those days our teachers felt no need to apologise for the Empire. They were proud of it. It was not without a feeling of thrill and pride that our young minds learnt the reason why so much of the world was painted red on the map. It was the British Empire in the old fashioned sense of the term.

Only Canada had come together as a Dominion. Australia was not yet federated, although the individual states had enjoyed "responsible government" for some thirty years. New Zealand was not a Dominion. Ireland was still an integral part of the United Kingdom. South Africa consisted of two Crown Colonies and two Boer Republics. The South African war had yet to be fought. Ceylon was a Crown Colony. India was divided between British India and princely states, the whole under the sovereignty of the Queen Empress. The Muslim League — let alone Pakistan—simply did not exist. A year after I was born, Cecil Rhodes led his band of pioneers across the Limpopo and took possession of those lands, which today make up the new Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

And yet times were already changing, though few of us realised it. In 1905, that great visionary Joseph Chamberlain, was able to assert that the British Empire was not really Empire; nor were the colonies really colonies. "What are we all?", he declared. "We are sister states". But as far back as 1864 that great Canadian statesman, Sir John Macdonald, had observed this same process of transformation. To use his own words:—

> "The colonies are now in a transition state. Gradually a different colonial system is being developed—and it will become, year by year, less a case of dependence on our part, and of overruling protection on the part of the other country, and more a case of healthy and cordial alliance."

That, I remind you, was in 1864.

I do not wish to take up your time in following the various stages in this process of transformation. Rather, I will hurry on to 1926 and to the Imperial Conference of that year. It was during the 1926 conference that Lord Balfour scribbled out on the back of a dirty envelope that classic definition of the Commonwealth which later appeared in the Report that bore his name. I would like to remind you of it.

> "Autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations."

In due course, the philosophy of Balfour found its legal expression in the Statute of Westminster But the Statute of Westminster was something more than the legal endorsement of the 1926 and 1929 conference, it carried Balfour's conception of the Commonwealth a stage further by permitting a member country to leave the Commonwealth if it so desired. Thus in the older Dominions the process of transition from direct colonial rule to complete independence was fulfilled. For those countries, who were advancing more slowly along the same road, the route was now clear.

To my mind, the Statute of Westminster was one of the great acts of history, the full significance of which has not yet been fully appreciated. It enormously strengthened the Commonwealth by affirming the principle of free association upon which it is based today. By its very existence it removed for ever the possibility that another

War of Independence on the 1775 pattern could be fought. That possibility for many years may have been only academic; but whether only academic or politically real it is good to have removed that remotest possibility with all the solemnity of legal act. Further, that affirmation prepared the Commonwealth as an association of nations to face the stress and anguish of the war that was to come. If any proof is needed of the success of the Statute of Westminster and of the two conferences which preceded it, that proof is to be found in the immediate response of the Commonwealth to Britain's declaration of war upon Germany in September 1939. Throughout the darkest moment of the war the bonds of the Commonwealth withstood the intense strain which was placed upon them and not one bond gave way under these strains.

One country only took full advantage of the opportunities afforded by the Statute of Westminster to leave the Commonwealth. That country was Ireland. And it took her the best part of eighteen years before she decided finally to sever her last link with the Commonwealth in April 1949. However, her decision to remain neutral during the war meant that for most practical purposes, she had already ceased to be a member of the Commonwealth. I think that one of the most important tests of membership is the willingness of one member state to come to the assistance of another in time of war. Whether in practice it would be possible for a member state to remain neutral in a war which involves all the others and after that war to continue as a member of the Commonwealth has not been put to the test. In theory there is no reason why she should not so continue. In practice it would depend much upon the attitude of the other members. In spite of the losses which the Commonwealth suffered at sea as a direct result of Irish neutrality, there is every reason to suppose that the other members would have welcomed her continued membership if she had so desired.

After a war as bitter and as extensive as the last, it was only to be expected that there should be further developments in the structure of the Commonwealth.

These developments were likely to take two forms. On the one hand a questioning on the part of the older members of the Commonwealth as to whether continued membership served any purpose, and a desire upon the part of those countries which had not yet achieved Dominion status to acquire complete sovereignty. As an example of the first type of situation let us take Australia and, as an example of the second, India.

At the end of the war there was a substantial feeling in Australia that her destiny should be linked more closely with the United States of America than with Great Britain and the other Commonwealth countries. The fall of Singapore and her resulting isolation, the American dominance of the Far Eastern war, the apparent similarity in their two ways of life, the common concern over Far Eastern affairs, were all obvious reasons for some Australians to think that more benefit to their country would lie in strengthening their bonds with America rather than with the Commonwealth.

So when I went to Australia at the end of last year I was prepared to find her somewhat restless about the Commonwealth. But that was not the case. On the contrary, I found a people who were very consciously British, who did not speak about diminishing the bonds of Empire but rather spoke about the necessity to strengthen them, who were far more concerned about alleged threats to the British way of life than we ever are in Britain.

I might add that at the same time she has been able to make particular arrangements with the United States, arising out of their joint interests in the South Pacific, without in any way prejudicing her position as a member of the Commonwealth. Experience shows us that such special territorial arrangements can be made between individual members of the Commonwealth and their neighbours without straining the bonds of the Commonwealth. Not only are Australia and New Zealand members of S.E.A.T.O., while we in Britain and Canada are not, but we are both members of N.A.T.O., while Australia and New Zealand are not.

If I may turn now to India, I believe the change of power there was inevitable. In my opinion, the decision on the part of the British Government to consider India within the terms of the Statute of Westminster was a wise one, although one may regret the haste with which that decision was made effective and must look on the slaughter which followed as regrettable in the extreme.

After receiving her full independence, it was open to India to follow Ireland's example and to leave the Commonwealth. She did not choose to do so, nor has she since. Evidently she finds it in her own interest to remain, for as Mr. Nehru recently explained to the Press, the Indian view of the Commonwealth is "based on a larger and enlightened self-interest of all parties concerned". And he went on to observe that "any form of co-operation must have this basis". So India, in spite of her buoyant nationalism and her desire to remain neutral, finds it advantageous to retain her Commonwealth connections. Nor is this connection unprofitable to the remainder of the Commonwealth. I believe that India's continued membership in the Commonwealth is the most powerful single influence for the improvement of understanding between Asia and the West.

At the same time, India decided to refrain from giving allegiance to the Crown and to become a Republic. This posed an important problem for the Commonwealth—could a country remain a member of the Commonwealth while denying any allegiance to the Crown? The Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in April 1949 agreed that she could, although India made it easier for the other countries to swallow this pill, and it was by agreeing to recognize the Crown as the "symbolic Head" of the Commonwealth.

I would like to add a comment of my own on the role of the Crown in the modern Commonwealth. The fact that we share a common sovereign is obviously of real importance. Nonetheless, to many Asian members of the Commonwealth the Crown has, in the past, symbolised alien rule—however enlightened that rule may have been. Hence we must not be too distressed as and when certain other Commonwealth countries should follow India's lead and become Republics. Just this month Pakistan has declared herself to be a Republic within the Commonwealth and has been accepted as such by the other members of the Commonwealth. We have to recognize the varying emotions which the institution of the British Monarchy evokes in the different peoples of the Commonwealth.

This brings me to the question of race relations within the Commonwealth. So far, the Commonwealth has stood against any colour bias. Well over 80% of the peoples of the Commonwealth are non-European. The granting of independence to India, Pakistan and Ceylon and their present position as equal members of the Commonwealth should be an adequate guarantee that the Commonwealth is not a club limited to white men. In the Colonies, charges of racial bias and colour bar, although they may exist within the social sanctions of the white settlers, are more than offset by the obvious application of Britain's traditional policy of assisting backward peoples towards self-government. The story of West Africa is further evidence, if further evidence is needed. The record is good and long may it continue to be so.

However, I must admit to having some apprehension over the direction of events in Africa. Africa is the great under-developed continent of the world; but Africa is stirring. Its peoples are backward, but they are on the move. The question is whether they will develop with us or against us. Will the Commonwealth appear to them as an association of friends or as a gang of thieves? I am afraid that the attitude in which South Africa is approaching these problems can hardly be described as imaginative; nor are their relations with the Asian members of the Commonwealth particularly sympathetic. But South Africa is not all Africa. If we are to bring Africa with us in our high purpose, we in the Commonwealth must concern ourselves with the affairs of Africa and give every assistance to the moral, social and economic development of that continent.

In my wanderings round the Commonwealth, I have been more pre-occupied with economic matters than with political, although it is difficult to separate the two. In no sphere of activity has the element of change been more striking than in the economic. For a long time men have been aware of the enormous resources which lay untapped and undeveloped in the Commonwealth, but the incentives and conditions necessary for their fuller exploitation were lacking—shortage of capital, lack of manpower and inadequate markets. The war altered the picture entirely. In the first place, the immediate demand for certain products for the war effort became so urgent that existing sources had to be worked harder and new sources opened up. Secondly, many parts of the Commonwealth were cut off from their previous sources of supply with the result that they had to try to develop their own indigenous sources. The end of the war did not see a reversion to pre-war patterns; the changes which had taken place during the war continued.

I could say much in detail about these changes in economic pattern but I would only say this. The pre-war conceptions almost amounting to economic laws have gone, and we see in what were primary producing countries a determination to insure against a repetition of their experiences by the establishment of indigenous sources of manufactured goods. As a result, we find growing industries in India, Pakistan and Australia. Some of these industries have been severely criticised as being uneconomic. As I have already stressed, generally speaking, they are not interested in how uneconomic they are. If they think that it is in their national interest to establish a certain industry, they will go ahead and do it—however uneconomic it is. This is a state of mind which we must accept and with which we must learn to live.

Commensurate with the desire to industrialise is a determination on the part of the Commonwealth countries to raise the general standard of living of their peoples. Countries like Australia, Great Britain and your own, have for a long time enjoyed a high standard of living relative to the remainder of the world. Nonetheless, in such countries we are determined to go on improving our standard of living. To do so we realise that we must continuously raise our level of productivity and make better use of all the resources available to us. The most sensational advances have, of course, been here in Canada—the opening up of the Alberta oilfields; the development of the iron ore deposits in Labrador; the aluminum project at Kitimat and now the St. Lawrence waterway, to mention but four schemes. These are as sensational as anything which has taken place in the industrial history of the world.

The facts of Britain's post-war recovery and her subsequent advance to new levels of production will, no doubt, be well known to you. In South Africa the great gold mining industry has been given a renewed lease of life by the discovery of uranium in the Orange Free State, which has more than off-set the declining nature of the gold mines and the financial difficulties which would otherwise have arisen as a result of America's refusal to alter the price of gold. In Southern Africa generally, and by that term I include the Rhodesias and the Belgian Congo, the expansion in all forms of mineral products has been impressive. If the political and racial frictions could be reduced, the prospects for Southern Africa would be good because the purely economic prospects are bright. Australia still has large areas of her continent unsurveyed.

The more backward countries are even more determined than the more advanced to raise their standard of living. The transference of political power in countries such as India and Pakistan has given a new impetus. The problem of poverty is basic to these countries. In the long run, the confidence of the people of India and Pakistan in their own economic, social and political institutions will be determined more by the success of their Government in dealing with the problem of poverty than by any other single factor. The present problem of poverty is not new—having never known anything else—but the idea that it need not always remain so is new. The fatalism of the centuries which accepted squalor and cruelty is giving way to a stumbling, but as yet undirected, movement towards the idea that poverty is not the inevitable punishment for over-indulgence in a previous existence, but something that the energy and organisation of man can overcome.

In the Damodar Valley the Indian Government is attempting a scheme similar but, of course, on a much smaller scale to the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States. In Pakistan the discovery of natural gas at Sui has led to ambitious schemes of development in the Indus Valley which will do a great deal to alter the lives of the 34 million people in West Pakistan. Interestingly enough, this scheme is not a solely government affair; it is a joint effort between the Pakistan Government, the Burma Oil Company and the International Bank.

There are, of course, many factors which limit the pace of economic progress—the principal ones being a shortage of risk capital and a shortage of trained technologists. In this particular instance, these shortages may be serious, but they are rarely critical. Today few really worth while projects die through lack of capital; similarly, when it comes to the point, enough skilled men can usually be found to get by on. The really limiting factors are political and social rather than economic—the disturbed international situation, bad racial relations, excessive nationalism, class conflicts—these more than a shortage of machinery, are the things which determine the current pace of economic progress. Although there is much which still has to be done, let us, nonetheless, give credit to what has been done in the post-war years to restore the economy of the Commonwealth and to expand it.

I have stressed the changes in the Commonwealth, but as I approach the conclusion of my remarks I would be liable to give a wrong impression if I were not to say something about the non-changing influences, indeed some of the permanencies which I believe contribute to the greatness of our Commonwealth.

As I have gone round the world, I have asked myself constantly, what is it that holds the Commonwealth together. For those of us of British origin, it is primarily a matter of possessing a common heritage, represented by bonds of race, blood, history and sentiment. But the majority of people in the Commonwealth are not of British origin—indeed not even of European origin. What is it then that holds us together?

In part, the bonds are historical; in part they are economic and possibly strategy is not wholly absent. But I believe that there is something more to it than that.

A bond which has struck me as being particularly important is the cultural, which I would distinguish from that of mere sentiment. In its most obvious form, this cultural bond is forged from similar educational systems—in many instances of actually having gone to the same schools and universities. In the case of India, I think this cultural bond is particularly important. I remember, when I was in Delhi just a year ago, a dinner at which there were five Indians and five Britons. The five Britons had been respectively, one to Glasgow University, one to Nottingham, one to Cambridge and two had not been to a university at all. All five Indians had been to a major college at either Oxford or Cambridge.

There is another bond which is apt to pass unnoticed, and that is one which arises out of common legal institutions. Excepting for certain differences in Quebec and South Africa, the law practised in Commonwealth countries is based upon the common law of England.

There are standards of integrity and of responsibility among the judges and lawyers of the Commonwealth which, I believe, are unique in the history of the world and whose importance to the preservation of personal liberty in the world cannot be exaggerated. I am not pretending that there are not odd cases of legal abuse, but I do contend that the general standard of legal practice throughout the Commonwealth is something in which we are justly proud and which is one of the distinguishing marks of the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth has no power by which it can force these standards upon any of his members and yet they seem to be there. It suggests another feature of the Commonwealth—that it is the similarity of public practices and institutions which keeps us together rather than any defined common purpose—let alone any common constitution.

If we look to our political life we find just as in our legal institutions, common practices and common ideals. We stand against absolutism; we believe in the importance of the individual; we believe in Government through consent rather than through force; we believe that Parliamentary Government is better where it can be made appropriate for the people governed than any other form of Government so far devised; we believe that the governed are more important than the governors. It is this common habit of thought based on parliamentary institutions which holds us together, but should we start thinking differently then the Commonwealth would be severely weakened. As "The Times" pointed out recently:—

> "The disintegration of the Commonwealth is less likely to come about through failure of the machinery than by the renunciation of its unwritten ideals. A country adopting a totalitarian form of government or committing itself to deliberate racial persecution or persistently bellicose would in the end find the partnership unworkable, whatever its relationship on paper to the rest."

Well, Mr. Chairman, these then are some of my thoughts upon our changing Commonwealth. In the course of a single life-time we have witnessed changes on a scale which might well have alarmed our fathers. But we have digested those changes and as a result, with its basic characteristics, the Commonwealth is better equipped to ride the seas of the contemporary world. No doubt there will be many more changes in the future, for finality is not in the language of politics. At times the character of these changes will tax severely the patience and understanding of the more conservative amongst us. However, let us remember change is not only inevitable, but in a progressive world it must be constantly in evidence.

Whether the Commonwealth meets the challenge of future events or not will depend above all upon the quality of our leaders. Given courage, sincerity and imagination, we will undoubtedly be able to steer a free passage through the future, as we have through the past;

but without those qualities in our leaders, we may well founder on the hidden rocks of the future. As Burke warned us, "A great empire and little minds go ill together". In the years of this century we have seen many changes both fundamental and nominal, but we say with conviction that for all these changes we are still a great empire.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. John W. Griffin, a Past President of the Club.

“CANADA—A WORLD PARTNER”

An Address by

THE HONOURABLE PAUL MARTIN

Minister of National Health and Welfare

Thursday, February 24th, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: We are honoured to have as our speaker today the Honourable Paul Martin, Minister of National Health and Welfare in our federal government.

Born in 1903 in Ottawa, Paul Martin obtained an honours Bachelor of Arts degree from St. Michael’s College, University of Toronto in 1925. He taught there for the next three years while studying law. In 1928 he received his M.A. and graduated in law from Osgoode Hall, Toronto. Through scholarships, he subsequently attended Harvard University, where he received a Master of Laws degree in 1929; Cambridge University, England and the School of International Studies, Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. Martin joined a law firm in Windsor on his return to Canada in 1930 and in 1934 became senior partner of the firm of Martin, Laird, Easton & Cowan. He was elected to the House of Commons in 1935 for the riding of Essex East in Western Ontario, and has represented it continuously since.

He has always taken an active interest in Canada’s place in world affairs. In 1936 he was Chairman of the Canadian delegation to the World Youth Congress in Ottawa. In 1938 he was an official delegate to the 19th Assembly of the League of Nations.

He was Chairman of the Canadian Government delegation to the International Labor Conference in Philadelphia in 1944 and delegate to the 94th Conference of the I.L.O. Governing Body in London, England.

On April 18, 1945, Mr. Martin assumed his first Cabinet post as Secretary of State. On December 17, 1946, he became Minister of National Health and Welfare, his present post.

Mr. Martin has been a government delegate to three sessions of the United Nations, was first Canadian representative to the Economic and Social Council and a delegate to two subsequent sessions.

From this it will be seen that Mr. Martin is well qualified to speak to us today on the subject of "Canada—A World Partner".

MR. MARTIN: The other day the Atomic Energy Commission of the United States, through Mr. Strauss, informed the world that the force of the modern H-Bomb is 1,000 times as powerful as the atomic bomb used in 1945.

This, of course, staggers the imagination.

In the face of this, it is worthwhile recalling that tomorrow there begins in London a meeting of five men representing five nations to begin discussions on a matter vitally affecting the peace of the world, the question of disarmament.

The five countries and the men are:

—Mr. Cabot Lodge of the United States
—The Right Honourable Mr. Nutting, Minister of State for the United Kingdom
—Mr. Jules Moch of France
—Mr. Norman Robertson of Canada
—Mr. Andrei Gromyko, the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union.

There can be no doubt about the urgency of the need for solving the problems that harass the world. Unless they can be solved, the world now divided by argument could be torn to pieces by armed conflict. The choice before us is destruction or the dawning of a better day.

Last Fall at the United Nations we were encouraged by the very considerable progress made on the separate but related problems of disarmament and the peaceful use of atomic energy. The Canadian delegation was privileged to play a leading part in the negotiations on these two questions. In the matter of disarmament, the Soviet Union and the Western Powers, by their joint sponsorship of a resolution proposed by the delegation of Canada, agreed on a common approach to this difficult and vital problem.

While we had no illusions about the significance of this degree of agreement, it did seem to present some indication of a lessening in the tensions that now so tragically divide the world. Events during the past few weeks, in such far away places as Formosa and Moscow have provided a grim reminder, however, that the temperature of the international climate may change with dramatic suddenness.

In view of the great interest centering on the meetings about to begin in London of the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission, it might be useful to review briefly some of the events leading up to this important development.

Two years ago the United Nations set up a Disarmament Commission. Last June a Sub-committee of this Commission met. On June 11, there was presented a set of proposals, known as the Anglo-French memorandum, which were accepted by four powers but rejected by the Soviet Union.

On September 30th in the General Assembly, Mr. Vyshinsky called upon the United Nations to conclude an international convention on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other methods of mass destruction. He announced at this time that the Soviet Union would not insist on an unconditional banning of atomic weapons before agreeing to a formula for the reduction of conventional armaments.

This was a complete reversal of the position that the Soviet Union had taken since 1946.

Following this speech, Canada decided to test the sincerity of this important declaration which, if genuinely put forward, represented an advanced position for the Soviet Union. We, therefore, proposed in the Political Committee a procedural resolution on disarmament. This Resolution was immediately supported by France, Great Britain and the United States and we invited the Soviet Union to join in co-sponsoring it.

In tabling the resolution I pointed out, as I do now, that armaments are a symptom rather than a cause of international tension. They are, as a great student of the art of diplomacy has indicated, primarily the reflection of international differences and only secondarily the cause of them.

Looking at Mr. Vyshinsky, I suggested "that any actions, however, which diminish international tensions and contribute to a real understanding in world politics are direct contributions to the solution of the problem of disarmament".

If the Soviet Union genuinely wished to make a real contribution to disarmament, permitting progress on such matters as the conclusion of a peace treaty with Austria would be a major contribution to this end, I reminded him. So would actions to grant a real, rather than a spurious national autonomy to those many European peoples, the control of whose destiny has in the past fifteen years been forcefully assumed by Moscow.

I said to Mr. Vyshinsky that the statement he had made on the 30th September was a heartening one. True we had been misled by Russia before, but could it be at long last that they had begun to realize the implications of the growing interdependence which technology is forcing on the human race? Or could it be because the men in the Kremlin had their eyes on the strengthening that was taking place in the defences of the West? In any event, Canada was making a proposal to reduce armaments, while, at the same time, joining with her sister nations of the West in making NATO stronger.

Mr. Vyshinsky called me on the telephone and, after meeting with our three co-sponsors, who selected Canada as their go-between, I agreed to meet with Mr. Vyshinsky. We had a series of talks—in his office, in my rooms and at our hotel. Thanks to the co-operative attitude of the three countries, and particularly the United States, I was able to make proposals which were finally accepted by Moscow.

As a result, for the first time the Soviet Union joined the West in a proposal which won, for the second time in the history of the United Nations, unanimous support on the part of its 60 member nations.

We had clearly indicated to the Soviet Union then that we were not going to make the mistake that the free world had made in pre-Hitler days. We were not going to disarm while a potential aggressor was arming. And so I said that a prerequisite of any disarmament system is certainly that no state should have cause to fear that its security would be endangered by the operation of a system of controls or any other feature of a like program.

When I reported on behalf of the three sponsoring countries that the night before Mr. Vyshinsky had told me of Russian acceptance of our amended resolution, I warned against hasty or irresponsible optimism. I indicated that there was still a great gap dividing us from the government of the Soviet Union. As a result of Mr. Vyshinsky's intimation to me the night before, the gap had been narrowed, but I warned, as I warn now, that

> "facile optimism, or wishful irresponsibility, would be fatuous and could be a grave disservice to the cause of peace."

Likewise did I warn against cynicism or despair.

If the meetings beginning tomorrow should end in failure, the responsibility will not be that of the West.

This important exercise of ours at the Ninth Session of the General Assembly did not in any way disturb the unity of the West or lessen the necessity for strengthening the collective security and the friendly partnership of NATO. For, as Mr. Pearson said, commenting upon the seeming inconsistency between what he had been doing in London and Paris, and what I had been doing in the United Nations,

> "The fact that opportunities may now exist at the United Nations for negotiations in the disarmament field, as in other areas, is itself the best justification of the collective policies which we have been pursuing on the political and the security fronts in London and Paris."

As a result of the unanimous acceptance of this resolution, the Disarmament Commission met in the Security Council Chamber on the 19th November, 1954, at 2:30 p.m.

By a curious coincidence, Mr. Vyshinsky was the Chairman. It was practically his last official act at the United Nations. It was this meeting that arranged for the important discussions that begin tomorrow. After the meeting, I walked over to him and acknowledged the accommodation extended in our mutual discussions and, putting my hand on his arm, I expressed the hope that we would succeed. Almost the last words I remember him saying were, "I hope so too". He died shortly after.

The Ninth Session of the General Assembly is notable for its achievement of another unanimous resolution: on President Eisenhower's proposal for a plan to develop atomic energy for peaceful and constructive purposes.

The United States has given a lead and the Government of Canada has indicated its readiness to support and participate in the plan. It now remains to be seen whether this new-found power of modern science will be attended by a statesmanship that would divert atomic energy from potential human destruction to the alleviation of the wants of mankind. Here again, the answer is to be found in the hearts and minds of the men in the Kremlin.

If we want peace in the world, we will have to work for it. And intelligent, patient and painstaking work it must be. Never was there a time when the challenge to human initiative was greater than at present, and never a time when the consequences of failure more terrifying. And so, through the United Nations and other instruments for international co-operation, we must keep up a steady attack on all the tiny roots and sources, the aggravations and misunderstandings that can lead to conflict.

If war is to be eliminated by getting at its roots we have to think of far more than the actual prevention of physical strife. We have to think of far more than the reduction of armaments. We have to think of far more than the control of atomic energy. In short, we have to think of all the possible sources of those irritations and disagreements that can lead men to seek recourse to armed conflict.

We are only beginning to realize how wide a field we have to cover. The field is almost the full range of human activity. These problems, whether they be in the social, political or economic fields, will call for the very best that trained minds and dedicated hearts can give.

As we look back over the recent course of these troubled years we should see the one essential fact—not the difficulties, the setbacks, the obstacles—but the distance covered. For I believe that progress has been made during the past nine years. I believe that the United Nations has helped to foster the logic of world co-operation against the deeply ingrained instincts of dissension and war.

What we must steadfastly seek is an international climate that is more conducive to friendly agreement when just and equitable solutions to the world's problems are put forward. It is no easy task to harmonize the complex and divergent ambitions, desires and ideals of sixty member nations. But, through persistent trial and patient effort, the United Nations has already found peaceful solutions to disputes that in other times would almost certainly have ended in conflict. In this time of peril, I earnestly believe that, given intelligence, understanding and forbearance on the part of men of good faith, the United Nations will yet find a formula for lasting peace.

In closing, let me recall that this week has been set aside throughout Canada as National Brotherhood Week. During this annual observance, the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews urges all Canadians to direct their thoughts towards the essential brotherhood of all men, regardless of race or creed or colour. As a citizen of the great cosmopolitan city of Windsor, with its rich medley of peoples, I have special reason to know the value of tolerance and mutual respect in the pursuit of human relations.

The Empire Club of Toronto, which takes its name from history's most successful association of free nations, is a singularly appropriate forum for the expression of the ideal of brotherhood in the community, national, and international sense. For in the Commonwealth, as in the Empire before it, there has been nurtured a genuine partnership among men of many continents who share a common devotion and a common love of freedom and justice.

Forty-eight years ago, when this Club was but three years old, the present Prime Minister of Britain, Sir Winston Churchill, described the essence of the Empire's strength and of its unity in these memorable words:

> "We . . . who look forward to larger brotherhoods and more exact standards of social justice, value and cherish the British Empire because it represents, more than any similar organization has ever represented, the peaceful co-operation of all sorts of countries, and because we think it is, in that respect at least, a model of what we hope the whole world will some day become."

This vision of a better world is still a shining source of inspiration and encouragement to the peoples of the Commonwealth and to all who share with them the determination to advance the cause of peace and brotherhood among the men and nations of the world.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. Marvin Gelber.

"MEN, MUSIC AND SCHOOLS"

with

TORONTO MEN TEACHERS' CHOIR

introduced by

DR. C. C. GOLDRING

Thursday, March 3rd, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: This is Education Week. To mark it, we have asked Dr. Cecil Charles Goldring, M.A., D.Paed., to speak for a very few minutes on Education and to introduce to us Mr. Eldon Brethour and the Toronto Men Teachers' Choir.

Dr. Goldrings needs no introduction to any Toronto audience. He has been connected with Toronto schools since 1912, as a teacher, as a Principal, as Inspector of Schools from 1927 to 1932, then as Superintendent of Schools for 13 years, and, since, 1945, as Director of Education.

In addition Dr. Goldring has been actively identified with many important educational, civic and community organizations. We are proud to include him as an active member of the Empire Club of Canada of which he is now Second Vice-President.

DR. GOLDRING: From March 6th to the 12th Education Week will be observed throughout Canada. The purpose is to bring to the attention of Canadians the work and accomplishments of their schools and educational institutions. With some concern I must report that last year the few days immediately following Education Week were observed in this city as "Aspirin Week". I was disturbed by the thought that someone might have found evidence to indicate that parents, having gone to school to compare the work of their children with that done by others of similar age, decided that they required more than the usual quantity of aspirin. However, I must say that during the year I have found no evidence to indicate that parents needed aspirin after a school visit, so perhaps my fears were groundless.

As special guests today we have approximately two hundred principals, vice-principals, supervisors, and teachers employed by the Toronto Board of Education and I should like them to stand now. These men and women have an average educational experience of something more than twenty-five years, so that you have in this room men and women who have collectively more than five thousand years' experience in educational work. With their colleagues, they are responsible day by day for the formal education of some 82,000 children in this city. It is interesting to think of the number and variety of lessons they have taught and of the countless number of children —now men and women in all parts of Canada—who have been influenced by their teaching. In those many years of experience the teachers have acquired knowledge and wisdom. They have learned that there is no magic formula for education, no fruit of the tree of knowledge which, swiftly eaten, can make us wise as gods, knowing good and evil. The process of education requires time and work and striving.

We are pleased to have with us today, too, several members of the Toronto Board of Education and I shall ask them to stand now. School trustees give many hours of their time each week, without remuneration, attending meetings in the interest of education in this city. They render a valuable public service.

We have educators from the Department of Education and from adjacent municipalities. I should like them to stand. These men have responsibilities throughout the Province and in areas outside of Toronto. We welcome them here today.

In imparting to citizens information about schools and their work, there are two channels which are used most frequently. One is to appeal to the eye. Accordingly, next week in various Toronto schools, open-house will be held and tens of thousands of parents will visit classrooms attended by their children and see samples of the work done. They will talk to their children's teachers. In some schools, films dealing with education will be shown to pupils and parents. Articles and pictures will appear in the public press and cards giving information about education will be shown on street cars and in some of the store windows. Some fifty thousand copies of a special edition of "The Ryersonian", produced by the Ryerson Institute of Technology, will be distributed to homes in Toronto. The paper will tell parents something of the work of the schools in this city. In addition to a visual approach, many words will be spoken in addresses on educational topics. In some of the churches, appropriate reference will be made to Education Week. Each day there will be educational broadcasts from 7:15 to 7:30 p.m. over Station CJBC.

For this, our Empire Club meeting, we have, I believe a unique programme—one which will appeal to both the ear and the eye—We have with us the Toronto Men Teachers' Choir composed of some seventy men who are teachers on our staff and who enjoy singing together. In another hour they will be back in their respective schools teaching or carrying on their regular duties. I know of no city on this continent which has a men teachers' choir of similar size and comparable record. This Choir has been in existence for approximately fourteen years and has performed frequently in Toronto and in various places in Ontario as well as in cities of the United States. For several years it has given an annual concert in Massey Hall, and in school circles the Choir is regarded as a valuable part of our educational system. It is a great pleasure to welcome the Choir, and for me to introduce the man who is the leader and has been the leader since the Choir was formed—Mr. Eldon Brethour, Director of

Music for the Toronto Board of Education. Mr. Brethour will say a few words about the programme and will then conduct the Choir.

— THE CHOIR SANG —

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. W. Eason Humphries, a Past President of the Club.

"EDUCATION AND INDUSTRY"

An Address by

HERBERT H. LANK

President, Du Pont Company of Canada Limited

Thursday, March 10th, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: We welcome as our speaker today, Mr. Herbert H. Lank of Montreal, the President of Du Pont Company of Canada Limited.

Mr. Lank is an international figure. Born in Seaford, Delaware, he was educated at the University of Delaware, and at three Universities in France.

After joining E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. in New Jersey in 1925, he was transferred to that company's affiliated organization in France. Returning to the United States in 1928 he was appointed assistant export sales manager of du Pont Finishes Division. Three years later Mr. Lank was sent to Argentina by the Du Pont Company and became the commercial director of its Argentine organization.

In 1942 Mr. Lank came to Canada from Argentina as a special assistant to the president of Canadian Industries Limited, in which the Du Pont Company held a 42% interest. He was appointed vice-president in the following year and a director in 1949. When C.I.L. was divided into two new companies on July 1, 1954, Mr. Lank became President of Du Pont Company of Canada Limited.

Outside his own business, Mr. Lank is well known for his work in the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. He has served as its chairman, is still a member of its executive council, and is a vice-president and director of the Canadian Council of the International Chamber of Commerce. In addition he is a director of The Toronto-Dominion Bank, a member of the Advisory Council of the School of Commerce of McGill University and active in musical and welfare organizations.

He will speak on "Education and Industry".

MR. LANK: Today, for the 29th time since its founding in 1903, this Empire Club audience is focussing its attention on education. I feel honored at having been given this opportunity during Canadian Education Week.

I propose to expose a few of my thoughts which are an extension of a theme by no means new to any of us. And I am thinking of you as a three-in-one audience: as business and professional men; as parents and as taxpayers.

You and I are shareholders in Canada's biggest business —education. Educationists would probably also assure you that education is Canada's biggest problem.

As shareholders, we have an investment in primary and secondary schools of about one billion dollars, and there is something unusual about being a shareholder in this enterprise: By law we are owners and by law we must remain owners. In any enterprise I know of, it is the owners who decide upon the objectives and judge whether they have been achieved. It is the public's concern, that is, *our* concern, to see that the product of the schools justifies the investment and meets the need. If the public has that privilege and responsibility as the owner of the Canadian school system and does not adequately exercise it, then we cannot properly complain if the results are not entirely satisfactory.

Have we any problems in Canadian education today?

The simple facts are we're seriously short of professionally-trained manpower — doctors, engineers, teachers, chemists, dentists, and we're even short of professional teachers to train these professional people.

As if our current shortage weren't bad enough, our growing population, our expanding economy, and the growing complexity of industrial processes are creating steadily increasing demands for technically qualified manpower. And educational requirements are rising for many jobs currently classified as non-technical.

At the other end of the pipeline, our schools are crowded with 3,000,000 young Canadians, most of whom will stay in school longer than their parents did. But of these 3,000,000 hopefuls too few will enter university; of those, too few will graduate; and of those who do graduate, too few will go into teaching. Every year the shortage of professionally-qualified teachers becomes more serious; we are actually losing ground. In 1951 the shortage was around 5,500; in 1952, 6,500 and in 1953, 7,000. One result is that today 20 per cent of our students in primary and secondary schools are in the hands of teachers who do not have *minimum* professional qualification. One bright spot is that the percentage of professionally-qualified teachers is slowly rising; but we are still woefully short in numbers.

You are as aware as I am of the factors that tend to make teaching unattractive for young people. Teachers' salaries have doubled in the past 10 years and trebled in the past 15 years but the average salary in provincially-controlled schools (excluding Quebec) was still only $2,510 in 1953. The real tragedy of the situation is that a large part of the public aren't really interested. A survey a month ago showed that over one-fifth of them don't even hold an opinion and another 44 per cent are so unaware of the significance of the situation that they are satisfied with today's teaching salaries. We can be thankful one-third had the courage to say present salaries are too low and we can only hope they prove to be a militant third.

Our continued progress, sociologically and materially, springs from the *development* and application of man's knowledge and man's ideas. Our hopes rest with the trained mind.

Today we just haven't enough trained minds or minds-in-training at the professional level. Industry may be slightly better off because it is able to out-bid education for trained people; but this is only part of a vicious circle.

The more qualified people won by industry, the fewer are available to train tomorrow's professions.

The answer does not rest with educationists alone but must come from the joint effort by industry, education and the community as a whole.

First and foremost, we must help to attract more young people to the teaching profession. How? By working towards higher salaries more in keeping with the social worth of the profession, by improving the instruction in teacher-training colleges and encouraging today's teachers to improve themselves.

Second, we must tackle the problem of having potentially good talent, remaining undeveloped, young people of obviously above-average character and ability who may lack the educational opportunities they merit and would seize. Drop-outs of such youngsters in secondary schools represent a loss the nation *cannot afford*. At the same time, we should stiffen our university entrance requirements, discourage the snap-course members (the "breeze boys") and encourage those with specific goals. False starts by undergraduates who lacked adequate counselling also represent a loss—to the university, the community and the individuals. By first year college we should be able to advise those who will make the best teachers, the best scientists.

Let's take a closer look at one specific problem: the critical shortage of qualified *science* teachers. Unless their number increases some schools may have to restrict science teaching as has already been done in some sections of the United States and the United Kingdom. At best, it looks as though the standard of science instruction will be lowered and even fewer students may be inspired by the zeal of their teachers to pursue their science studies in university.

In Ontario alone, the proportion of specialized teachers has dropped 15.6 per cent in the past 10 years but the proportion of science specialists has dropped 24.5 per cent. Of the 650 Ontario science teachers in 1953, only 40 per cent were specialists and of these only 15 per cent were under 35 years of age. This suggests also that as present specialists reach retirement age there will be too few even to replace them. To maintain even the present proportion of science specialists in Ontario secondary schools, an annual average of at least 20 honor graduates in science should be entering the teaching profession. In 1953 and again in 1954, only five specialists in science enrolled at the Ontario College of Education. This year nine are preparing for science teaching.

This survey, incidentally, was made recently by a committee of educationists who were asked by my company to suggest where financial aid by industry could best be used. This committee recommended annual scholarships to university science graduates to encourage them to take further professional training to prepare them to become secondary school teachers. They further recommended that fellowships be made available to those already teaching, to do postgraduate work in science or to enable teachers to attend postgraduate summer courses in science.

Here is just one way, it is felt by educationists, in which industry can aid the teaching profession in meeting a common and urgent need.

You are undoubtedly familiar with many effective plans for supporting graduate and postgraduate students. The Massey Report dealt pointedly with this subject and said: "The most effective way to create equality of educational opportunity is through a well-devised system of national scholarships." The Report went on to say that Canada, by her too great dependence on American fellowships for advanced study, particularly in the humanities and social studies, has starved her own universities which lack not only money but the community of scholarship essential to the best work.

One facet of this problem is under study at the present time, the matter of Canadian students in science and engineering who are attending American universities for their postgraduate studies. The Chemical Institute of Canada is conducting a survey this month among such students to learn why they chose an American university rather than a Canadian one, what changes in the current academic picture would have induced them to pursue such studies in Canada, whether there was an advantage in the amounts of fellowships offered in the United States, and what their attitude is towards potential career opportunities in Canada and the United States. The results of this study, which is being underwritten by one company, should be of practical interest to Canadian educationists, business men and government officials.

Considerable *is* being done in education-industry cooperation. Gifts for buildings and equipment, the endowment of chairs, are obvious additions to the pattern of scholarships and fellowships. In 1951 some 900 Canadian companies reported to the Committee on Corporate Giving that their gifts to education were approximately 10 per cent of their total "charitable" donations. I would hasten to question whether business gifts to education should be classified as charitable donations: I suggest they are an essential cost of doing business and staying in business.

Obviously much more money could be put to work in education. Our national bill for education is still only about three per cent of national income though it has risen slightly from the 1929 percentage of 2.7.

Of course, money alone is not enough to ensure the effective and adaptable program of education required by our dynamic society. Industry should also make available to education some of the knowledge and experience it has accumulated through years of applied research, production and management administration.

Just as an example, many companies have in their employ capable engineers, and other scientsits who could contribute to the practical training of university students. At the same time, there are in the universities teachers who feel out of touch with industrial developments. Why not an exchange scheme whereby industry loans a selected man to teach full or part-time in the university which, in turn, would send a teacher into industry for a defined period, thus broadening his experience and bringing a fresh viewpoint to bear on some of industry's problems.

We in my company are well pleased with our experience in employing university and secondary school teachers during the summer. For example, at our Maitland plant we had with us last summer two teachers from the Brockville Collegiate Institute and an associate professor of chemistry from the University of Toronto. We plan a repeat this summer, because it's good business for them and for us.

In addition to the methods of help already mentioned, industry can provide much more in the way of teaching aids, more informative booklets, films and process charts; it can arrange more plant visits for students and teachers alike; it can provide more assistance in vocational guidance at all levels, by having representatives take part in student forums and bringing in school vocational counsellors to study first-hand your needs and standards.

Even more pointedly, there is need for an informative booklet outlining career opportunities and satisfactions in the field of teaching, for distribution throughout the secondary schools. The teachers' organizations would gladly provide the material if a sponsor would arrange publication. These career opportunities might similarly be publicized in national advertising throughout Canada.

One of the newer major developments at the university level is the school of business administration. Judging by the number of senior employees encouraged to take extended courses, these schools are undertaking to provide a helpful and practical service. But they must be assisted by business itself in planning and organizing their programs, must draw on us for material and frequently borrow instructors and discussion leaders.

The basic needs, of course, are for closer liaison between education and industry right across the board, so that needs, plans and methods are mutually understood. I wonder, for example, how many educationists have any realistic idea of the time and effort devoted in business to staff recruitment, training and development. That is a major function in every well organized business. One of our department managers periodically reminds his staff that one of his prime responsibilities is to find people he can conscientiously promote; and I can assure you it is one of his most difficult duties.

On the training of production staff, I would cite an illustration from one of our own newer plants, a rather technical operation employing several hundred people who were previously inexperienced in the type of thing. Among other technicians we required 30 instrument mechanics for whom there is a rapidly rising need. We recruited our men, each with junior matriculation, and then gave them each 780 hours of training, equivalent to more than 19 five-day weeks. We gave them specific training in mathematics, physics, chemistry, draughting, care and use of equipment and so forth. The training cost per employee in that group of 30 was $1,600, including wages, instructors and incidentals.

I'm glad to add that this new demand for instrument mechanics has been recognized and a course is now available at the Ryerson Institute of Technology here, a fine example of education responding to industry's needs. As industrial operations grow increasingly complex, educational requirements for industrial jobs will continue to rise—and continue to evolve as technology changes.

This microphone before me is a reminder that more and more of us these days feel we have something to say on this vital subject of education. In fact, it's one of the more popular topics in thoughtful groups, public and private.

Like any head of a family and employer of young Canadians, I have some knowledge of what is going on in the educational field and among our Canadian educationists. I believe most of them are quite aware of what could and should be done to improve our educational system and that they are taking aggressive and imaginative action to the extent that you and I, as taxpayers and business men, make it possible for them to do so. I suggest that they have too often been getting rather low grades from the Canadian public, when they should have been receiving the A's they deserve.

Adequate support will be forthcoming only when the public comes to realize the extent of the nation's current and long-term educational needs, and to realize what joint action must be taken to meet those needs.

Canada will continue to grow only to the extent that trained manpower is available to develop the reserves of natural wealth and of the spirit. Canada will continue to grow as we equip ourselves with new technology and apply it. Canada will continue to grow—in the broadest and best sense—as our material progress is accompanied by deeper satisfactions for the individual. Our future well-being will be best achieved by parallel development of the technical skills, the social sciences, the arts and the spirit.

Education cannot stand still any more than life can stand still. If our educational development is to match that of our nation's it must advance—and on a broad front. It will inevitably do so if each of us takes an active and intelligent interest in it, if we become informed of what our schools are already doing for us, if we realize how dependent our national growth is on our educational system, and if we think out more clearly what the future requires of that system.

Education in Canada will progress as we are prepared to turn theory into practice; and thoughts into action; as we are prepared to match the dedication of our teachers with our own dedication of dollars and individual interest.

As taxpayers and as business men, we have in this heavy responsibility, a wonderful opportunity—if we have but the vision and courage to realize it. And may our children and their children say of our generation—"they gave to us that jewel which no thief can steal—the wealth of knowledge".

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. C. R. Sanderson, a Past President of the Club.

"NATURAL GAS COMES TO TORONTO"

An Address by

OAKAH L. JONES

Vice-President and General Manager
Consumers' Gas Company of Toronto

Thursday, March 17th, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: We welcome as our speaker today, Mr. Oakah L. Jones, Vice-President and General Manager of Consumers' Gas Company of Toronto, who will tell us of some of the problems connected with bringing natural gas to Toronto and indicate what natural gas may mean to us.

Mr. Jones has had a wide experience in the utility field. Born in Boston, Massachusetts, he started his business career with Cape Breton Electric Company in Sydney, Nova Scotia. For 13 years, from 1923 to 1936, he was with Blackstone Valley Gas and Electric Company in Rhode Island.

In August 1936, Mr. Jones joined Oklahoma Natural Gas Company as Assistant Treasurer, Secretary and Comptroller. On November 1, 1950 he was promoted from that capacity to the top administrative post of Division Manager of that Company's Tulsa district. Mr. Jones left there to come to Consumers' Gas Company of Toronto in July 1954.

He will speak to us on the timely subject of "Natural Gas Comes to Toronto".

MR. JONES: In this week's MacLean's Magazine I was attracted by the heading on Beverly Baxter's London Letter: "I Would Choose Toronto".

I think all of us are always interested in reading articles on our home towns, but in this case I was doubly interested, for, as many of you who are my friends and acquaintances in this audience, know, I too chose Toronto recently to be my home.

Mr. Baxter went on to say: "Toronto has a character entirely its own. It is not the capital of Canada any more than New York is the capital of the U.S.A., but it grows in strength and size and power—just like New York. The city fathers try to keep pace with the development, but Toronto continues to outgrow itself like a boy and his school clothes. Toronto was intended by nature to be a city of infinite beauty."

And after completing the article, my mind went back to that sentence: "Toronto was intended by nature to be a city of infinite beauty". And thinking further I decided I did not want to give the talk I had prepared on "Natural Gas Comes to Toronto" but did want to keep just the title and so prepared a new one thinking along the lines that we in The Consumers' Gas have an obligation, we the shareholders, the employees, want to make Toronto—Metropolitan Toronto and the communities close by "a city of infinite beauty" so that others too as the letter was headed "would want too to choose Toronto".

And how can a company like Consumers' Gas and Natural Gas help, and be helped toward that aim? To begin with, we have 3,900 shareholders right here in Toronto. That is out of a total of 6,700 and the majority of the rest are in Ontario or the other provinces. So we are not plagued with absentee management or holding company ownership—our owners are our neighbours and customers.

Then we have 1,179 employees—men, women—with husbands—wives—mothers, fathers, sons, daughters living here—again interested in the same thing you and we as citizens are interested in. Sincerely sorry when a job is not well done and they are justifiably criticized. Happy when a customer calls or writes and tells me of something, someone of them has done well. And speaking of that they are rather proud that in this winter conversion from manufactured to natural gas they, starting November 7th and finishing February 17th, they did the job without a single solitary accident—not a fire, explosion—not even a dented fender throughout all that winter weather.

So here we have over 5,000 shareholders and employees interested in the future, yes in the present of our community and since the common practice is to assign 4 members to a family—it can be said that Consumers' Gas through wages and salaries and return to shareholders is helping support directly over 20,000 people. Now this income, Consumers' Gas must meet, comes from the prosperity of the area, for we are not like a store or a bank or a wholesale house, etc., we can't close up and move to some other place. If business is not too good here, if it is not a good place to live, we still have to stay here for our right to do business, our pipelines, our customers are here. So it behooves us to want to make this Toronto a good place to live in and to help other people to want to choose Toronto.

And that's what we did recently for when we found that the cost of manufacturing gas was so costly both labour and materialwise as to be pricing ourselves out of business, we started looking for a new source of supply which could eventually result in establishing new lower competitive gas rates.

Yes, that is where natural gas comes into this picture for the first time. We had to look for a less costly gas that would meet competition. Coal was out—we'd used it for years and couldn't compete. Oil was out for we also have machines whereby we made gas from oil but that couldn't compete. We also have propane tanks and again that method was too costly.

So with the approval of the Queen's Park and the Dominion Government we negotiated for a supply of natural gas in the only area where it was available to us (pending building of the line from Western Canada) and that was in South Texas and Louisiana. There eventually with the approval of the Federal Power Commission in Washington we contracted on a firm, irrevocable basis for a 20-year supply and made a contract too to transport the gas by pipeline 1,600 miles to the Niagara River where we pick it up in a 20″ line at 850 pounds pressure and bring it here to Toronto and distribute it to you, our customers.

Natural gas is interesting. It was formed hundreds of millions of years ago by tremendous pressures on minute occupants of prehistoric seas. It is said that the only way to find it is to drill for it and gas is found in wells all the way from 500 feet deep to 12,000 feet in depth and in spite of the hundreds of thousands of dollars spent on geology, geophysics, etc., companies still drill about 4 dry holes for every one productive of oil and gas. For again, may I remind you that natural gas is part of the same great hydro-carbon family as is oil, and that the natural gas we get seldom comes from a field in which there is nothing but gas but comes from gasoline plants which have removed the sulphur, the water, the oil, the natural gasoline, etc., before starting delivering this clean fuel into the pipeline for delivery to us.

And as a hydro-carbon it has many more uses than those of which we normally think, heating, cooking, water heating, cooling in the Summer, clothes drying, etc., but is used as a raw source of chemicals, fertilizers, synthetics and the like. Did you know there are 25,000 industrial uses for natural gas? Just think of what that means to the future development of this area and the placing of us in competitive position with other countries and communities having natural gas.

Oh but you say we don't want to ruin our city with industrial smoke for you said Mr. Jones that you wanted to see it more beautiful. And that I do, but natural gas can also help with its cleanliness in industry and the home.

I admire our city fathers for their efforts on behalf of smoke abatement. How many times in driving downtown from the clear blue sky of a winter morn a few miles out have we driven into what we believed was an overcast sky when really all we were doing was driving in under a cloud of smoke and soot with its attendant adverse effect on health and property.

Mr. Baxter with tongue in cheek also said: "I am told, in whispers, that snobbery still exists in Toronto, and that the old families, or what is left of them, look down their noses on those of lesser antiquity."

But I have never over the years on my visits here from Cape Breton and the States found Canadians that way. We are a friendly people. Reserved slightly? Yes, but basically, fundamentally, friendly and helpful. Where could you find more courteous police, fire and other civil servants? Our clerks in the stores, our waitresses, our taxi drivers are all salesmen for our city. And there again is where our employees, our Consumers' Gas family can, does and will help. Whether it is working in the Church of their choice, or in a civic club helping with crippled or handicapped children, in the Community Chest, Salvation Army, Y.W.C.A., or Y.M.C.A., men and women of a company must not just support these organizations financially but to an even greater extent support them with their time, and with their ideas.

We must take the positive approach. A few years ago you remember that there was a popular song, "Accentuate the Positive", and that always reminds me to remind our salesmen "Tell the positive side of natural gas, don't knock the other fellow's product. There is plenty of business for all, but tell of natural gas, its cleanliness, economy, ease of use, safety and so forth."

I like to have our street crews when asked a question by a spectator tell what they are doing and why and by the way, you'll see a lot of these crews around this area this year and next for we will be spending about 10 million dollars per year of our investors' money running gas lines into every section of the city, every new sub-division until we have gas within a quarter to one-half of a mile of every prospective customer. No, we will not run out of gas, for our lines will carry every foot we will sell and also for peak loads and standby capacity we are maintaining part of our oil gas and propane plant and our storage holders available on an instant notice.

Yes, natural gas has come to Toronto and sometime in the near future natural gas will arrive from Alberta and the West and as soon as it does, we are permitted under our contracts to discontinue the supply from Texas and Louisiana and start taking this Western Canadian gas. And that will be a good thing for our Canadian economy for we'll be using a natural resource now either being wasted or not in production. We'll be spending our dollars in Canada and with that line also will be helping develop our Canadian communities all along the new line. Our efforts towards load building will be helpful toward the day when that line is built and its capacity utilized for the good of all the people.

I have been asked numerous times what is Consumers' Gas greatest job ahead of it right now. My answer is that over the years with the old rates we had in effect we couldn't build the average consumption per customer as other natural gas companies here and in the states were doing. Our job now is to build up our sales as fast as possible. Yes, faster even than possible! We have started on that by setting the competitive rates which became effective on February 17th last, regardless of the fact it reduced our estimated net income far below the cost of doing business temporarily. We need to get as much house heating, as much industrial load as we can, for by building those sales we will be in a position to make further rate reductions, and further rate reductions will mean still further sales.

A company, a community, is known for the service it gives. Our Company's contributions must be:

Good Dependable Service
Competitive and Fair Rates
Fair Salaries and Wages
A fair Return to our Investors
And Being a Good Citizen.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. We are proud of our 106 years of tradition but, we want next year and the year after to be even more proud of the way you will feel about us and to make Beverly Baxter and all other citizens here say:

"I'M GLAD I CHOSE TORONTO".

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. Alexander Stark.

"FEARS AND FANCIES OF THE FORESTS"

An Address by

DOUGLAS WHITE AMBRIDGE

President and General Manager
Abitibi Power & Paper Company Limited

Thursday, March 24th, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: We welcome as our speaker today, one of Canada's outstanding business executives — Douglas White Ambridge, C.B.E., B.Sc., the president and general manager of Abitibi Power & Paper Company Limited.

Born in Mexico City in 1898, Mr. Ambridge was educated at Lower Canada College, and, following three years service overseas during World War I, at McGill University.

For four years after his graduation in 1923 Mr. Ambridge was control engineer at the Iroquois Falls, Ontario, plant of Abitibi Power & Paper Company Limited. Subsequently he held senior executive positions with Anglo-Canadian Pulp & Paper Mills Limited, Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company Limited, and Ontario Paper Company Limited. He returned to Abitibi, the first company for which he worked, in 1946 as president and general manager.

During World War II, Mr. Ambridge served as Director, Shipbuilding Branch and then as Director General of Shipping with the Department of Munitions and Supply in Ottawa. He was made a director of Polymer Corporation Limited on its formation in 1942, subsequently was made vice-president and from 1945 to 1947 president.

Mr. Ambridge will speak to us on "Fears and Fancies of the Forests".

MR. AMBRIDGE: First of all let me say to you, Mr. Chairman, how sincerely I appreciate this opportunity of addressing your Empire Club in this great city.

I have entitled this address, "Fears and Fancies of the Forests", and I hope that when I have finished you will all know why I have done so.

Ever since the very earliest ages in mankind's long history the forests have exerted fascination on man. I suppose that this was so because the interior of a forest is a mysterious place, but, whatever the cause, there is no question that early man venerated the trees and that forests and groves of trees were often the scene of religious exercises.

Sir James G. Frazer in his classic work, "The Golden Bough", gives us a long and very interesting account of tree worship among all peoples of the earth ever since the dawn of history. We read that among all the great European families of the Aryan stock tree worship is well attested. Among the Celts the oak worship of the Druids is familiar to every one. The heathen Slavs worshipped trees and groves which they maintained about their villages where even to break a twig would have been a sin.

Trees were considered to have souls or spirits, and trees being animate were thought to be necessarily sensitive to pain. Frazer quotes an ancient English paper which records the startling fact that when an oak is being felled "it gives a kind of shriekes or groanes that may be heard a mile off as if it were the genius of the oak lamenting."

The Indian tribe, the Ojibways, very seldom cut down green or living trees from the idea that it puts them to pain, and some of their medicine men profess to have heard the wailing of the trees under the axe.

Sometimes it was the souls of the dead which were believed to animate trees. Some Philippine islanders believe that the souls of their ancestors are in certain trees, which they, therefore, spare. If they are obliged to fell one of these trees they excuse themselves by saying it was a priest that made them do it.

The natives of Sumatra endeavour to lay the blame for all such misdoings at the door of the Dutch authorities. Thus when a man wishes to clear a piece of forest land for cultivation it is necessary that he should come to a satisfactory understanding with the woodland spirits who live there. For this purpose he goes to the middle of the plot of ground, stoops down, and pretends to pick up a letter. Then unfolding a bit of paper he reads aloud an imaginary letter from the Dutch Government in which he is strictly enjoined to set about clearing the land without delay. Having read this he says, "You hear that spirits. I must begin at once, or I shall be hanged."

We see, then, that ever since ancient times the forests have been very much to the fore in the thoughts of the men who live near them and who derive so many of their rude comforts from the trees in the forests. We must also note that much of the thinking which, since ancient times has been done about the forests, has been beclouded by superstition and by ignorance.

Do not, I pray you, think for a minute that in our practical, down to earth, scientific age, all of the hocus-pocus has been removed from the forests. Quite the contrary!

In my own experience in the pulp and paper business I have seen quite a good deal of these ancient superstitions dressed up, of course, in modern dress. During the last 30 years there have been characters upon the stage in Canada who have played very convincingly the part of, let us say, the king of the wood of ancient Rome.

One such gent was a man by the name of F. J. B. Barnjum who was in his prime in the twenties and early thirties. Mr. Barnjum was a wealthy lumberman who was obsessed by the idea that the forests of Canada would be completely cut down in a very few years. Let me quote for you some of Mr. Barnjum's writings. In the Pulp and Paper Magazine of May 22, 1924 there appeared a long article from which the following excerpts are taken.

> "Over large portions of Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick 75% of the supposedly living trees are today diseased by fungi, a more subtle and deadly enemy of the forests than the spruce budworm or any insect pest;"
>
> "Once a tree of the forest has been attacked by fungi, its fate is sealed, and the serious factor is that where 60 to 75% of the growth in a forest is affected by this insidious disease the balance or the 25% is doomed just as surely as if 75% of a population were affected by tuberculosis where there could be no segregation and where all were huddled together, coughing and expectorating all over one another, which is exactly what is occurring in our forests since the wind blows the spores of the fungi all over the living as well as the diseased trees."
>
> ". . . So that our large areas of mature or nearly matured forests are doomed, at least in the above named provinces through attacks of the spruce budworm, bark beetle or borer, fungi, fire or wind—all of which causes combined must complete the work of destruction within a period of 10 years, with the added proviso that fire alone may complete this destruction in half that time . . ."
>
> ". . . The average layman may well ask what has brought about this appalling situation. The answer is very simple, namely *mad exploitation of our forests for the immediate dollar without any regard for the future*."
>
> "In emphasizing the statements I have made above I have no hesitation in saying that the forest situation as it exists in Canada today, is probably the most deplorable ever faced by any country in the world's history."

And so on and so on for pages and pages in the leading trade magazine of the Canadian pulp and paper industry just thirty years ago.

Now Mr. Barnjum was not by any means an irresponsible citizen. When he died in 1933 Dr. Clifford D. Howe, at that time Dean of Forestry at the University of Toronto, paid him this tribute:

> "He was perfectly sincere and his motives were patriotic. If in his enthusiasm for the cause he had made his own, he occasionally fell into the error of extravagance of statement, that is an error that is liable to befall men, zealous for other worthwhile causes, in unguarded hours."

which is a charitable way to put it. Personally I prefer to think of Mr. Barnjum as one of a long line of men whose ancestor was probably a king of the wood in Roman times.

But F. J. B. Barnjum is not the only man in modern times who has not hesitated to use the superlative in his writings about the forests. In the July 29, 1950 issue of the Financial Post an article was published, written by J. D. Gilmour, a retired forestry engineer. The article was headlined in letters ⅝″ high "Facing Ruin through World's worst Forest Laws?" In this article Mr. Gilmour writes as follows: "The whole of Canada is notorious for poor forest laws and poor management. Among foresters this is well known, including the fact that Ontario is the worst of them all. This means that Ontario has the worst forest policies and administration of all the civilized regions of the world. Disaster, therefore, must be inevitable, and signs of it are clear to all foresters who know the situation.'"

Please note the inevitable superlative. Ontario has not got the second worst, it has the very very worst forest laws, according to Gilmour.

Now, Mr. Gilmour is an old friend of mine and he is not an alarmist over the ordinary goings-on in life, but when it comes to the forests he throws caution to the wind, unlimbers his superlatives and lets fly. His forbears, it seems to me, may have been Druid priests who knew well how to enforce their religious disciplines by scaring the hell out of their congregations.

Still another artist with extravagant statements was the late E. E. Johnson, the multimillionaire lumberman who spent the last years of his life engaged in waging a private war on the pulp and paper industry. New Liberty magazine, in October 1950, ran an article on Johnson, entitled

"Fight of his Life." In this article the following paragraph appears:

> "But at 62 lumberman Eddie Johnson, waging what he regards as the most vital fight of his life, gives himself no rest at all. After 40 years of spectacular enterprise in the North American forests, he has now pitted all his resources against what he calls 'a vast pulp and paper monopoly.' Of this fight he says: 'I have launched a direct offensive—up till now I've been a gentleman.' Tight-lipped, stubborn and fiery he claims he is conducting a holy war."

Surely some of E. E. Johnson's Scandinavian forebears, priests perhaps in the gloomy forests of Sweden in antediluvian days, must have stirred in their graves.

Not long ago, three or four years ago, there was formed in the City of London, Ontario, an organization known as "The Friends of the Forests." This was an organization in the great tradition. Among its leaders were several of the clergy, notably the Rev. G. A. Peddie who was the treasurer, and the Rev. Dr. B. C. Eckhardt who was vice-president and chairman of the executive. These two reverend gentlemen went to Washington in June 1950 to testify before an American Congressional Judiciary Committee and according to the New York Times "levelled charges of monopoly against the newsprint industry in their own native land." The New York Times' report goes on to say, "Asserting that he 'might well go to jail' for some of the things he was about to tell the subcommittee the Rev. Dr. B. C. Eckhardt said that newsprint interests in his native province of Ontario are so powerful that they have blocked efforts to conserve the forests there."

So far I have not heard that the Reverend Dr. Eckhardt was ever sent to prison for having made this false allegation against the most important industry of his native province.

The by-products of all this hullabaloo about the forests are commissions, some Royal and some not so royal. But Royal Commissions appointed to investigate forestry conditions are nearly always sitting somewhere or other in this great realm of ours.

Some seven or eight years ago we had one in Ontario. This was a Royal Commission but with only one Royal Commissioner who was given wide powers to investigate every conceivable aspect of the forest resources of Ontario. Major General Howard Kennedy was chosen to be the solitary occupant of the investigational throne.

In due course, after about a year's work, General Kennedy issued a report.

The public, the press and some of the politicians were all greatly pleased and gratified. Here was the stuff to give 'em. Here was a man of eminence who was not afraid of the big interests. The report was widely quoted especially those parts of it in which could be found the most severe castigations of what Kennedy called the "operators" by which he presumably meant those companies engaged in the forest industries.

The Commissioner began at the very outset by dealing the operators a body blow in the following terms: "The most striking impression made on the staff of the Commission has been the tremendous, almost incredible, waste resulting from single purpose operations carried on in the past and still being carried on by most of the operators." Note once again the superlatives and note also that the gallant and honourable Commissioner nowhere in his report tells us whether this almost incredible waste is 10% or 1% or 1/10 of 1% of the operators' annual cut.

Further on, General Kennedy, warming to his task, attacks the managements of the "major components of our forest industry." He complains that the top executives in the industry have reached the summit by way of mill operations, finance, sales or accounting and he records his impression that a majority of the top executives never go into the woods except on their occasional visits to their hunting and fishing lodges.

This is unnecessary and untrue but it makes great reading for the uninformed public, who immediately jumped to the conclusion that General Kennedy was a knight in shining armour who in prowling around the forest groves had caught the dastardly pillagers red-handed.

After 177 pages of fault finding and lecturing all and sundry on their deficiencies and malpractices we come to the final chapter entitled: Forest Operating Companies. A Solution. The first sentence is the following: "Throughout this report there have been frequent references to a plan which would be unfolded in the final chapter."

The Commissioner then unfolds his plan which, to put it mildly, was so impracticable that nothing more has ever been heard of it. I do not believe that General Kennedy himself has ever publicly advocated the adoption of his so-called plan since the report was published.

I have no time to describe to you what this plan was except to say that it was a "dilly", but when I hear complaints that these very expensive Royal Commission reports are almost always pigeon-holed I ask myself what else could be done with the "Solution" proposed by the last Royal Commissioner to sit in judgment on Ontario's forests.

So much for the fears and the fancies of our forests. Let me give you now some facts.

First of all we must keep in mind all the time that the pulp and paper industry is the keystone of the arch of our Canadian economy. Anything which hurts this industry hurts Canada. That is fact one.

Secondly, we should realize that the men who are charged with the responsibility for managing the pulp and paper industry in Canada are not a lot of bloated capitalists complete with silk hats and long cigars. By and large the managers of the Canadian pulp and paper industry are men who started at the bottom and worked their way up. And when I say worked I mean worked. They are not all men of wealth but all of them without exception are good citizens of Canada who are just as interested in maintaining the health and productiveness of the forests upon which all our livings depend, as anyone else is.

As one of the group of senior executives of the greatest Canadian industry I have felt that we have not done a very good job in supplying the public with facts as an antidote for their fears and fancies. This same thing is true in the United States, and in recent years the pulp and paper industry down there has been paying a lot more attention to publicizing the facts of the forest and has made some progress in removing the fears and fancies, regarding the forests, of the average American citizen.

Let me do my part here today and let me very briefly indeed tell you some of the things which our own company foresters and woods managers believe to be true in the Province of Ontario.

(a) Spruce, balsam and jackpine over the whole province are not being cut as fast as they are growing and the use of these species could be expanded.

(b) The increased utilization of hardwoods is greatly to be desired as only 6% of the allowable cut is now being harvested.

(c) Good progress is being made in increasing the use of what are generally regarded as less desirable species, i.e., jackpine and poplar.

(d) The pulp and paper industry in this province as a whole is not overcutting, and in fact the drain on the forests caused by all industry is less than the annual yield.

(e) The control and eventual elimination of forest losses due to forest fires is one of the most important problems to be solved and excellent progress is being made by the Department of Lands and Forests aided by their ancient air service and by the recent arrival on the scene of the modern helicopter.

(f) The research work which is being done by the pulp and paper industry in the private laboratories of individual companies and by the central research organization of the industry is of great importance and is steadily, if slowly, improving the yields of useful materials from the species of trees to be found in our forests.

This picture I have drawn for you is not one which should cause loud lamentations and the frantic wringing of hands. It is a picture of sincere and earnest men hard at work, flying helicopters, planning new equipment for mills and woods, experimenting with new processes, devising new products.

These men do not use superlatives, do not try to frighten anyone. They are not self-appointed saviours of the forest. They do not even know the words of the song about only God can make a tree.

They are good Canadian citizens, the backbone and the muscles of Canada's greatest industry and as such they are, I think, entitled to all the support and encouragement that the public as a whole can give them.

Before I sit down I should like to extend to you all an invitation from my Company, and I am inviting you all to do the following.

If any one of you in your capacity as a responsible citizen of this Province feels that he or she would like to know more about our forest situation I invite you to write either to me or to our Vice-President in charge of woodlands operations, Mr. C. B. Davis. Ask any questions which interest you. We will do our best to answer them either by correspondence or by a personal interview.

If then you would like to check up on what we tell you it seems to me you are free to consult with the Department of Lands and Forests of the Government of Ontario, where you will find a group of men whose knowledge of Ontario's forests is unequalled, whose integrity is unquestioned and whose sincerity of purpose is fully appreciated by all those who deal with them.

Let me then appeal to you to go to the professionals if you want to know about your Province's forest situation. We will be only too glad to help you get the facts.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. J. Palmer Kent, Q.C.

"NEW CHALLENGES OF NORTH AMERICA'S 'FASTEST' DECADE"

An Address by

RALPH JARRON CORDINER

Thursday, March 31st, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: We welcome as our speaker today one of the outstanding United States' business executives—Ralph J. Cordiner, President of General Electric Company.

Born in Walla Walla, Washington, 55 years ago, Mr. Cordiner was educated at Whitman College, graduating with high honours with his Bachelor of Science degree in 1922.

After a year in the commercial division of the Pacific Power and Light Company, Mr. Cordiner joined the Edison General Electric Appliance Company of Portland, Oregon, a wholly-owned subsidiary of General Electric Company. Since then he has, at various times, held the position of manager of five of the company's major divisions.

Mr. Cordiner joined the War Production Board in December 1942 as director-general of war production scheduling and three months later became vice-chairman.

Returning to General Electric in July 1943 as Assistant to the President, Mr. Cordiner was elected vice-president in 1945 and Executive Vice-President and a director in 1949. In December 1950 he succeeded Mr. Charles E. Wilson and General Electric's fifth president.

General Electric has 135 plants in 105 locations and 28 states of the United States, and employs over 210,000 people. It is owned by over 295,000 shareholders. Its subsidiary, Canadian General Electric Company Limited has 12 plants in eight communities employing over 14,000 people.

We feel honoured to have the head of this important and widespread enterprise here today to give his first speech in Canada. His subject will be: "New Challenges of North America's 'Fastest' Decade".

MR. CORDINER: The opportunity to meet with you today is one which I have been looking forward to since last May when members of the Business Advisory Council of the United States Department of Commerce were honored by the attendance at a meeting at Hot Springs of eight distinguished Canadians, representing a cross-section of the viewpoints of Canadian industry, commerce and finance. The Honorable Douglas Stuart, United States Ambassador to Canada, urged upon members of our Business Advisory Council the great mutual benefits to be derived through participation in discussions of economic, political and social objectives at meetings such as this. I would like to qualify myself therefore as not only a friend and admirer of our country's Ambassador but also a firm disciple of his philosophy concerning the value of an interchange of ideas.

Possibly I should further qualify the standpoint from which I express the views of a United States citizen by giving you a brief personal background. All four of my grandparents were born and spent their entire lives in Scotland. My mother came to the Northwest Territory in early womanhood, and my father spent his early boyhood until sixteen years of age in Guelph, Province of Ontario, Canada. I spent most of the first 30 years of my own life in the Pacific Northwest which afforded a background in many respects similar to great areas of Canada, notably the Province of British Columbia. From both my parents and friends in Canada I have long since learned to understand and appreciate a Canadian's justifiable pride of citizenship and enthusiasm for the growth and development of your great country. Many Canadians have advised me that when on visits to the United States or Europe, they have been affronted upon being classified as Americans, as though they and the citizens of the United States were one and the same. While the similarity of our economic problems in mining, agriculture, industry, lumber, commerce and trade is very great, it is not in any sense identical.

Today what I would like to discuss is not a plan or a program for the development of Canada, but rather, acting on Ambassador Stuart's suggestion concerning the value of the interchange of viewpoints, to explore and discuss problems existing in the United States, with emphasis on a few examples of problems which can be turned into opportunities for continued growth and progress if we can reach agreement upon the correct long-range answers.

Ascertaining what the United States viewpoint is on many of our social, political, and economic problems of the day must often be very confusing or misleading to observers in other countries. Much of the misunderstanding of United States opinion results from a failure to recognize the essential fact that different geographic locations within the United States have entirely different approaches at various times to national policies, and those attitudes are closely linked with underlying geographic and economic issues. In speaking of geographical differences, I refer not to the 48 individual States, but more particularly to broader classifications such as the Northeast Atlantic Seaboard, the Southeast, the Midwestern States on the banks of the Mississippi and the Ohio Rivers, the Southwest and the Rocky Mountains, and the Pacific Coast States. The differences between these regions, I would assume, are probably similar in nature to the economic and political differences among the various groups of provinces in Canada.

Oftentimes visitors from Canada express amazement that viewpoints voiced on the floors of the House of Representatives and the Senate are quite contradictory to impressions gained from discussions with friends and business associates in New York City and Washington, D.C. Further confusion undoubtedly arises from the fact that since World War I our two main political parties have appealed to the voting public at the time of national elections on platforms which bear little relation to subsequent legislation. Unfortunately, in recent years, these major parties have compromised on many fundamental issues, seeking support from economic pressure groups. Do not be misled by publicity concerning strong opposition within either one of the parties which might lead you to believe that a third or "splinter" party was shortly to be established. The balance of power at the Congressional level usually resides with a very few pivotal states. Knowledgeable political writers are convinced that election to state and national offices is now determined largely on the merit of the individual candidates rather than on party platforms. We saw examples of the public's reaction to the strengths and weaknesses of individual political candidates contrary to national trends in electoral preference as recently as the Fall of 1954.

But I am not here to talk about politics in the United States. Rather, as a basis for understanding viewpoints on other problems, I wanted you to have in mind that, fundamentally, the people of the United States are not as divided as you might believe through reading newspapers or magazines, or listening to news commentators on radio or television. In the United States, as in Canada, we are great believers in the freedom of thought and expression for each individual; so you are bound to hear differences of opinion expressed.

In economic matters, we are also believers in the freedom of individuals to compete. Those of us who are devout supporters of a competitive enterprise system cannot stress too strongly our belief in the necessity to protect the weak against the economic power of the strong. We believe sincerely in our laws designed to enforce this protection and to prevent all forms of cartels or combinations to control markets.

One final point about interpreting the significance of political opinion in the United States; it is important to keep in mind that under our constitution any legislation may be subject to review by the judicial branch, and that decisions of the Supreme Court oftentimes tend to negate, implement, or set aside completely legislative acts.

Now as an industrialist with the good fortune to be associated with the great and dynamic electrical industry, I would like to talk to you briefly on one man's opinion as to what lies ahead in our economy. In speaking of the next decade, our prospects of growth are so great (and I believe that in Canada you may have prospects in much the same proportions), that it is difficult to discuss the future without seeming to be guilty of "braggadocio." The United States, I know, is sometimes criticized, and often justifiably, for making superlatives a habit of expression. This attitude could well come from a feeling of inferiority because of our youth as a nation. It also reflects a historical resistance to acceptance of direction from Europe or allegiance to European customs. Possibly with increasing world-wide travel by people from the United States, and as more and more citizens from other countries visit us, we in turn will become more world-wide in our viewpoint and understanding. The habit of superlatives may further be encouraged by the intense competition we have at the market place in our own country for both products and services, and there may be an unfortunate tendency to carry this attitude over on other fronts.

In order to put the economic growth of the next ten years in proper perspective, it is important to remember the very rapid increase of our population. Last year in the United States a baby was born every eight seconds. Our total population increase during 1954 was 2,700,000 persons, adding the equivalent in one year of a city larger than Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, or the equivalent of Canada's two largest cities, Montreal and greater Toronto. Our most conservative forecasts prophesy a population of 180,000,000 by 1965, and many of us are of the opinion that it will approximate 200,000,000 by 1970.

During the period from 1955 to 1965 our Gross National Product in terms of 1954 dollars is expected to increase from 360 billion dollars to 500 billion dollars. Please do not think that I am falling into that habit of "braggadocio" that I criticized a moment ago. In my experience during World War II years with the War Production Board in Washington, I learned a lesson which all bureaucrats surely must accept, that the first digits in a set of figures are the important ones and that the number of zeros are all relative. So I could well have stated that the United States Gross National Product will increase from 3.6 million to 5.0 million in ten years. Many industries—notably the chemical, petro-chemical and electrical—will double in the next ten years.

Recognition of these dynamic factors in our economy is occasioning the spending of great sums of money on projects designed to serve the needs of our citizens in all classifications. Large-scale programs have been implemented or are proposed in industry, commerce, transportation, and agriculture. The rate of private capital investment for new plants and more productive equipment which now approaches 30 billion dollars a year, is expected to increase to 60 billion dollars by 1965.* In addition, we will be making huge expenditures to make up for shortages in the social necessities of hospitals, churches, and schools. President Eisenhower has proposed the expenditure of 101 billion dollars in Federal, State, and local funds for highways in the next ten years.

We are a country of travel and movement. Possibly too much of our travel has been within our own borders in the past. But, like Canadians, we inherit from our ancestors a tradition of mobility. We have continually been moving more and more to the west, and—especially since World War II—increasingly to the south and southwest. One of our great problems in large industrial communities of the United States today results from the mistake of having ignored this tradition of mobility. This is a problem which undoubtedly you gentlemen of Canada will study very closely and guard against by doing your customary good planning. Either in the past or in the present, both management and professional labor leaders

*Source: Joint Committee on the Economic Report, Potential Economic Growth of the U.S. During the Next Decades, U.S. Congress, 1954.

in the United States have acted as if it were desirable first to concentrate great industries in a single location and then to freeze those concentrations as they exist so that it is impossible to correct the mistakes of the past. Thus, to use but a few examples, we have concentrations of such great industries as automobiles in Detroit, Michigan, rubber in Akron, Ohio, steel in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, garment working trades in New York City. When a disproportionate concentration of the population is dependent upon a single industry, a host of economic and social problems are apt to follow.

Unfortunately, all too few managements of large and small corporations have seen the importance of taking new industrial employment to communities where there are available workers rather than crowding further our already overstrained large industrial centers. Too few of our professional labor leaders have recognized that there are more positive and progressive solutions to the problem of seasonal or cyclical unemployment than proposals such as the "guaranteed annual wage" which run counter to our traditions of freedom of individual choice and mobility.

Possibly, I speak of the desirability of geographical decentralization with more than the normal personal conviction because the Company with which I am associated has historically operated in relatively small communities. In our post-war expansion we have followed this policy with the single exception of our great Appliance Park in Louisville, Kentucky, where a common large facility for all of our major appliances makes it possible to serve our customers better through consolidated carload shipments. Thus we have established new factories in many towns with which you may not be familiar—to mention but a few, in De Kalb, Decatur, Mattoon and Bloomington, Illinois; Anniston, Alabama; Rome, Georgia; Asheboro, Hickory and Hendersonville, North Carolina; Tyler, Texas; Anaheim, California; Burlington, Vermont; Sommersworth, New Hampshire; yes, and even in Limerick, Maine.

This expansion has not in any sense been at the expense of those communities where we were previously well established. On the contrary, employment at our older locations such as Schenectady, New York, Pittsfield, Massachusetts, Lynn, Massachusetts, and Fort Wayne, Indiana, has increased substantially in every case.

Another problem we have in the United States, which is equally an opportunity to gain better understanding, is the failure in some segments of the population to realize that our long-term growth and prosperity depends upon the degree to which our large corporations are managed in the balanced interests of our customers, our share owners, our employees, our suppliers, the public and their servants, the Government. A current example of misunderstanding is the distorted meaning which is being given to the word "automation," as if it were a weapon to be used against employees rather than a method of making human effort both more productive and more rewarding. Union publications run cartoons portraying workers being turned into mechanical men. The same type of bugaboo lulled industry into a period of non-accomplishment for approximately eight years during the 1930's. The bugaboo word then was "Technocracy." Today "automation" is being given the same false meaning. It is implied that the great majority of our employees are suddenly to be replaced by some great mechanical robot. The truth is that "automation" will come about by a gradual process of evolution rather than revolution. And rather than being an evil, it is the only possible solution to the attainment of the predicted growth in our Gross National Product by 1965 which is required to satisfy the needs of our growing population. Despite the population growth in this ten-year period, the available work force, the number of those of normal working age, will increase only 11 per cent due to the low birth rates of the depression years. And in the same period our minimum goal for continued progress is an increase in production of more than 40 per cent.

We need better understanding that the real opportunity to create more employment is not by resisting our natural inheritance of mobility, not by resisting progress in technology, but rather by putting more and more effort and attention upon research and advanced engineering development. If I may be pardoned for again using the Company about which I am best informed as an example, this is exactly what we in General Electric have been trying to do on the theory that it is in the best interests of the five groups previously referred to: our customers, our share owners, our employees, our suppliers and the public. Since 1947 our Company has invested some billion one hundred million dollars in new and improved laboratories, factories, and equipment. Approximately 150 million dollars of that expenditure has been for improved research and advanced development facilities. Approximately 70 per cent of the total has been for modern processes, machine tools and equipment to lengthen the arm of the worker and to assure our customers of better, higher quality products.

I would like to speak briefly on one other subject which possibly relates closely to the question which may be uppermost in the minds of many of you at this point, namely, "What can I do with regard to my own operations to attain a portion of that growing opportunity in the United States?" And that brings us to the question of trade and commerce. It is reasonable to assume that any contractual agreement between an individual and his company, or between two individuals or two companies, or between two nations such as Canada and the United States, will not permanently prevail unless the arrangement is fair and equitable to both parties. It is for that reason that we use the expression "Reciprocal Trade Agreements." Increasingly our enlightened citizens recognize that we have an obligation and a responsibility to earn friendship and better understanding through world trade, and that this is particularly important as between countries such as Canada and the United States because of our common border in this great area of North America.

While we believe in the mutual advantages of trade between countries, I am sure that you will not misunderstand me. I would be chagrined indeed if my associates in the United States did not make every possible effort, through application of research, engineering and manufacturing techniques, and through competitive pricing, to earn for their company an ever-increasing share of the market for electrical goods of all types. You saw evidence of that in our recent successful quotation on the St. Lawrence power project where General Electric won in the competitive bidding for all 16 of the hydro-generators on the United States side, and the Canadian General Electric Company, Ltd., will install eight of Canada's 16 units. Our Large Motor and Generator Department in the United States was able to compete successfully against European bidders, where hourly wage rates in the shop are only one-fourth as much, apparently because of a combination of research and engineering know-how and our investment in the best of facilities.

Finally, when we cross your borders into Canada as an electrical manufacturing Company, we recognize that all you Canadians very justifiably want to develop your own country in your own way with your own people. For that reason in the year 1892 the Canadian General Electric Company, Ltd., was established. Through this company the research and technical knowledge of the entire General Electric Company in the United States is made available to Canada. And may I add that the flow of information is definitely a two-way street. Our associates in the United States have found answers for many of their problems from our Canadian associates.

I spoke earlier of the post-war expenditures of the General Electric Company in the United States, referring particularly to the major emphasis placed on research and advanced development laboratories and on new processes and equipment. Through the contributions of the Canadian General Electric Company, Ltd., to the economy of this country, we hope we are equally a good corporate citizen of Canada. New and improved facilities added since 1945 by the Canadian General Electric Company, Ltd., have cost three times the amount previously invested. Employment has increased from 4,500 persons in 1939 to approximately 14,000. As you undoubtedly know, the Canadian General Electric Company, Ltd., is staffed principally by Canadians. Throughout General Electric we keep the opportunity of transfer, which exists among the various operating departments in the United States, open world-wide to all employees. Many of you, I am sure, are familiar with the emphasis the General Electric Company has placed on improved education and training in the United States. It is therefore greatly reassuring to us in the United States that we are not alone in seeking the solution to our educational and manpower development problems. The requirements of the Canadian General Electric Company for engineers and college graduates of all types who have been fulfilled almost entirely by graduates of Canadian colleges and universities. In addition to the approximately 1100 graduates of these colleges and universities in Canadian General Electric, we have about 110 graduates of your colleges and universities serving with General Electric Company in the United States. Canadian General Electric Company, Ltd., has had its own "test" engineering course to provide advanced training for engineering graduates since 1907 and concurrently with our present effort in the United States the Canadian Company has increasingly aggressive programs for training people in other functions of the business. Through the combination of your educational institutions and your industries' advanced training programs, Canada is therefore making a very substantial contribution to our mutual and tremendous needs for manpower development.

Three years ago in Evendale, Ohio, there was an unusual program of celebration to dedicate the new headquarters of the Aircraft Gas Turbine Division of the General Electric Company. The program was entitled, "The Fastest Ten Years in History"—another example of the United States fondness for superlatives, you will note, but also in fact a literal description of the accomplishments in jet engine development from the date of the first successful flight on this continent. From the standpoint of not just aviation alone but of our entire economy, the next ten years will have to advance even more rapidly if we are to keep up with the needs of the growing populations of both the United States and Canada. The challenge of the next ten "fastest" years in North America should provide a thrilling experience for businessmen of both countries sharing the opportunities of a great continent. Surely all of us will meet the challenge more successfully if we can benefit from the interchange of knowledge which Ambassador Stuart has urged upon us.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. Sydney Hermant.

"THE PEACETIME APPLICATIONS OF ATOMIC ENERGY"

An Address by

DAVID ARNOLD KEYS

Scientific Adviser to the President,
Atomic Energy of Canada Limited

Thursday, April 7th, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: The potential peacetime uses of atomic energy are the subject of much discussion and speculation. The current boiling stock market activity in the uranium issues is based on the expectation that many uses will be developed for atomic energy.

Consequently, we are fortunate to have as our speaker today, one of Canada's outstanding scientists and a leader in the field of nuclear physics—Dr. David A. Keys.

Born in Toronto 64 years ago, Dr. Keys graduated from the University of Toronto in 1915, winning the London Gold Medal in Physics and the Governor General's Medal for Trinity College. He took his M.A. in 1916 at Toronto, and earned Ph.D.'s from Harvard in 1920 and from Cambridge in 1922. He has been awarded Honorary Doctor of Science degrees by McMaster, McGill and Toronto universities.

From 1922 to 1947, Dr. Keys was on the staff of McGill University. He was appointed a member of the National Research Council in 1945, and two years later became Vice-President (Scientific) in charge of the Atomic Energy Project at Chalk River, Ontario. Since December 1953, he has also been Scientific Advisor to the President, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited.

Dr. Keys will speak to us on "The Peacetime Application of Atomic Energy".

DR. KEYS: No scientific discovery has created such devastating possibilities and at the same time offered vast opportunities for the benefit of mankind as that of the controlled release of atomic energy by nuclear fission. As each year passes since the first chain reacting pile proved possible in 1942, more extensive and important peaceful applications of this release of enormous quantities of energy from atomic nuclei are being developed for the benefit of humanity.

Canadian scientists and engineers are engaged in fundamental research and peacetime uses of atomic energy providing basic knowledge upon which the present and future depend. It is natural that this is so, for the fundamental discoveries from which this new science has developed were made in Canada by the late Lord Rutherford and his associates during his nine years as Macdonald Professor of Physics at McGill University (1898-1907). Even in those early days, both he and Soddy recognized the great possibilities of obtaining large amounts of energy from atomic structure. Here is what Rutherford wrote in 1903:

> "There is reason to believe that an enormous store of latent energy is resident in the atoms of radioactive elements . . . If it were ever possible to control at will the rate of disintegration of the radioelements, an enormous amount of energy could be obtained from a small quantity of matter."

That he still had this possibility in mind, when later at Cambridge, is shown by the report of a lecture he gave in 1921:

> "Each atom, though it is quite incommensurable, has in it the power of a thousand horses. If we can harness this power almost all our material difficulties are at an end . . . Infinite material power is at our fingertips awaiting release by finer and finer instruments."

Today electric power is being developed from nuclear energy and as I shall mention later, vast quantities will be available to serve industry within the next decade, fulfilling Rutherford's predictions.

Like many another scientific development accelerated by world political unrest, atomic energy has its destructive as well as its constructive uses, which were also clearly discerned a half century ago, as the following quotation from an article by Soddy, appearing in 1902, will indicate:

> "What controls these gigantic forces (inside the atom) is still a mystery. The question whether it will ever be found possible to draw upon them for this world's work remains in consequence unanswered. The knowledge of their existence must, however, alter our attitude towards inanimate matter, and make us regard the planet on which we live rather as a storehouse stuffed with explosives inconceivably more powerful than any we know and possibly only awaiting a suitable detonator to cause the earth to revert to chaos."

The answer to the first question can now be in the affirmative, and the latter speculation appears unlikely.

The Nuclear Reactor

The only natural occurring element, from which scientists have learned to release atomic energy, is uranium. But uranium metal consists of atoms having different masses, 0.7% of uranium atoms having a mass of 235 and remaining 99.3% having a mass of 238. It is only the atoms of mass 235 which are fissionable, that is, from which energy is released. There are several types of reactors now in operation in different parts of the world, all using either natural uranium or uranium artificially enriched with uranium 235, or one of the new fissionable elements produced in a reactor. They differ also in the type of coolant used and in the moderator for slowing down the neutrons, which may be either pure graphite or heavy water. You have all seen photographs of such "atomic ovens" in the press and popular magazines. Our Canadian NRX reactor, which uses heavy water as moderator, has been described as that of most advanced design by both British and American authorities. It is provided with experimental facilities which, combined with its high neutron flux density, enable our scientists to perform investigations that would be difficult, if indeed possible, in any other reactor. It operates at an output of 40 million watts, generating the same energy in the form of heat as that required to keep 660,000 ordinary 60 watt electric lights burning continuously! The new NRU reactor now under construction at Chalk River will be even more powerful with several times the flux intensity, and is also provided with facilities for research which will expedite the results of investigations awaiting solution.

Reactors perform three main functions apart from the research facilities specially provided in the Chalk River piles, each of which is susceptible to improvement and useful expansion:

1. They produce a large variety of radioisotopes which offer great opportunities for application in industry, agriculture and medical therapy.
2. They produce vast quantities of heat from small amounts of nuclear fuel. This heat in most cases at present is conveyed by the coolants at low temperatures to rivers or the ocean where it causes only slight local changes in the temperature of the water. It is, however, a potential source of producing steam to generate large quantities of electrical energy.
3. They can produce new nuclear fuel out of non-fissionable material, thus increasing the amount available to supplement the only naturally occurring fissionable element—the 0.7% of uranium which has atomic weight 235.

Much has yet to be learned of the application of all three products of the release of atomic energy. Let us consider the possible applications of each of these fields of atomic energy release in the next decade.

Radioisotopes

Several hundred new radioisotopes of the previously known elements have been produced in reactors and in addition eight new elements all of atomic weights heavier than uranium have been created, which were not present on our earth 15 years ago. These isotopes emit radiations which are not only detectable and permit quantitative measurement but may be one of three types—atomic particles, electrons and y rays, the latter being short X-rays. When they emit these rays, they decay into other elements, at rates which vary from a fraction of a second to thousands of years, rates which are characteristic of each particular isotope. Already many of these isotopes have industrial uses in radiography of castings, welds and inspection of internal parts of machines—replacing X-ray machines of various penetrating power. Extensive use of cobalt 60, iridium 192, caesium 134 as well as sodium 24, gallium 72 and lanthanum 140 is now an accepted practice. Small portable lead caskets weighing only 20 to 30 lbs. have been developed, which contain isotopes that emit radiations comparable to a 100,000 volt X-ray machine. As no auxiliary equipment is necessary, these units will find many industrial and medical exploratory applications. Other isotopes which emit electrons are at present employed in thickness gauges for controlling the thickness of various pliofilms—paper, rubber or metal sheets. Several hundred such gauges are now in operation in the United States and Canada. Use has also been made of such isotopes for measuring the thickness of tin on tinplate, covering of threads with thin layers of lubricant and in testing the wear of various moving lubricated parts of machines. For many purposes they are by far the most sensitive means of detection and measurement.

Some isotopes emit particles, which when mixed with phosphors produce luminous paints, useful for reading dials, finding switches or house numbers, in the dark. Those which eject energetic rays, nuclei of helium atoms, if mixed with beryllium constitute excellent neutron sources. These are applied in oil well logging.

As tracers in chemical industries or in studies of medical physiological action of hormones, drugs, etc., the particular chemicals can be labelled with a radioactive isotope of the inactive element and thus its particular function followed. One company last year is reported to have saved over $100,000 and another was able to perform with the use of isotopes at a cost of $35,000 what would have meant an expenditure of over $1,000,000 by conventional methods, accomplishing in weeks what might otherwise have taken years. Much information has already been acquired regarding the effectiveness of fertilizers, absorption of nutriment by roots, aquatic plants and creatures, as well as the habits of insects. A limited number of isotopes—cobalt 60, iodine 131, phosphorus 32 and gold 198 have therapeutic values in treatment of diseases.

During the next quarter century we shall have a very large quantity of radioactive fission products in the "ashes" from reactors—so much indeed that the storage or disposal of them will need considerable research. Many of these will perhaps find application in the sterilization of food, drugs and bandages, etc. Preliminary investigations have already shown that heavily irradiated potatoes, for example, retain their fresh state without sprouting over long periods. Radiation may alter the taste or nutrition value of food but biochemists will discover means of eliminating such undesirable results by their research. If radiation be found to prevent deterioration of whole-wheat flour and other vegetable products, fruits, milk and meats, kept at normal temperatures, the application of fission products for such purposes would help solve their disposal. The radiations from isotopes absorbed by plants cause mutations and some of these will probably be found to be beneficial—rust resistant grains, improvement in yields, and more readily harvested. Millions of dollars are being spent each year on medical research into the cause and treatment of cancer, heart disease, arthritis and polio and we may expect that radioisotopes will assist in the solution of their causes and in their treatment.

Radiations are known to assist in promoting polymerization of certain organic compounds and we may expect this property to be developed as an important function in the new petrochemical industries now being established in Canada as a result of modern research and the discovery of large supplies of oil and natural gas in the Western Provinces. When it is recalled, how the discovery of a single catalyst replaced in a few years the whole natural indigo industry by providing a cheaper and better artificial chemical dye, it is not difficult to realize that similar discoveries using radioisotopes may bring about similar changes in industrial products.

Nuclear Power

The most important application of nuclear fission will undoubtedly be the production of steam for operating conventional turbo-generators to produce electricity and power. The fission of a pound of nuclear fuel releases as much heat as obtained from burning 2,700,000 lbs. of coal, 360,000 gallons of gasoline or about 30 million cubic feet of natural gas. In a reactor using natural or enriched uranium fuel, it is possible to have so much heat generated that the uranium metal will attain any desired temperature up to its melting or even evaporating temperature. However, the uranium metal must be sheathed with some metallic coating to prevent the fission products from entering the coolant, which must be used to remove the heat and also to avoid chemical action of the coolant on the uranium. Since most materials, such as steel, copper and fire-bricks cannot be used owing to their high absorption of neutrons, we are limited at present to a few sheathing materials, such as aluminum, zerconium, beryllium. The sheaths must be good thermal conductors, to remove rapidly the heat from the uranium. Then the coolant must also be a poor absorber of neutrons and be able to carry the heat to heat-exchangers for the production of steam. Furthermore, the fuel, if metallic uranium be used, must be treated in such a way as to reduce any changes in shape, expansion or contraction, which would interfere with the rate of flow of the coolant. Methods of permitting long burning time, with the consumption of a large fraction of the fuel without its removal for chemical processing to withdraw the ashes, which have a "choking" effect, similar to ashes in an ordinary furnace, must be developed.

To overcome many of these metallurgical and chemical problems, numerous types of reactors have been suggested.

Pilot plants have already been constructed in which steam is produced that is used for generating small amounts of electricity. These are experimental units to explore the possibilities of designing larger commercial plants. Electricity was first produced in such a pilot plant in December 1951, and a different design safely generated electricity in February 1953. The first large power plant, which commenced operation last summer, was the nuclear power unit to drive the U.S. atomic submarine "Nautilus." All three nuclear power plants mentioned are in the United States.

The need for more power, owing to the rapid increase in demand for electricity, which is prevalent in all countries, has led to intensive feasibility studies of developing large commercial atomic energy plants to supplement the present hydro and coal-burning sources of energy. Such plants are now under construction in both the United States and in the United Kingdom. These particular nuclear reactors will develop commercial quantities of power and are different in their construction and method of operation. The 60,000 kilowatt plant being built by Duquesne Light Co. near Pittsburgh, will use pressurized water as moderator and liquid coolant. The American Atomic Energy Commission is undertaking a two hundred million dollar programme to design and construct five different experimental types of power plants. Four will produce electricity but it is not expected at a competitive cost with present power producers. Several private American utility companies are now engaged on the design of atomic energy plants with a view to constructing them to augment their supply of electric power, using nuclear fuel to replace coal or oil.

In Great Britain, it is estimated that by 1970 the annual production of coal for power will be short as much as 20 million tons and it is expected that much of this deficiency will be met with nuclear reactors. Atomic energy offers such great opportunities of obtaining large amounts of energy from comparatively small amounts of fuel, it is not surprising that the first major decision to use nuclear fuel in place of coal for the commercial production of electric power is that recently announced by the British Government. According to this programme they will construct, at a cost of 300 million pounds, 12 atomic energy stations to be completed and in operation within ten years. These units are expected to supply about two thousand million watts, equivalent to that produced by burning 5 or 6 million tons of coal annually. The first stations will be graphite moderated, natural or slightly enriched, uranium fuel, gas cooled with carbon dioxide, the heat of which will produce steam to operate a conventional turbo-generating plant. They will be in operation in 1962. The other types will be liquid cooled, four ready by 1963 and the remaining four in 1965. The cost per kilowatt hour is estimated to be 7.5 mills, not much different from the present cost of power from coal-fired units. The experience gained in design and construction, as well as operation of these units, will enable the British to maintain their economy as their supply of coal becomes inadequate and will also provide a basis for possible export based on the knowledge acquired.

Canadian scientists and engineers have not neglected the great possibilities of generating useful power from atomic energy. For more than a year a team of engineers from the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario and other utilities have been engaged with the Chalk River staff on the design of a prototype pilot plant to produce about 20 million watts. It is expected that power from nuclear energy can be generated at a cost competitive with that from coal but such factual knowledge can only be gained by actual experience. The Government has announced that this pilot plant will be built jointly by the Federal Government and the Ontario Hydro, the Canadian General Electric Company doing the design in cooperation with the staff at Chalk River. This unit will be in operation by 1958 and will serve to establish whether the future demands for electrical energy in Ontario will be met by large plants using nuclear fuel as a replacement for coal. Ontario has already used practically all the available sources of hydro electric developments and has had to construct two large steam plants to augment her supply. Even with the coming into performance of the Sir Adam Beck II plant at Niagara, and the completion of the St. Lawrence power development, it is estimated that by 1962 or a few years later, other sources will be required—hence, the interest in producing nuclear energy plants which will be competitive with coal. Furthermore, we have an additional incentive to use nuclear power, since Canada is one of the largest potential sources of the basic nuclear fuel—uranium.

Physicists are optimists, but engineers are courageous also, and many are now learning the fundamentals of modern physics, which adds enthusiasm to their more practical outlook. We may very well have in addition to submarines, ordinary ships and even airplanes using nuclear power. The necessary shielding to protect the personnel is still a requirement which will prevent its use in small units, such as motor cars. Many of the problems requiring solution are chemical and metallurgical. The removal of fission products is necessary for they capture neutrons, are the source of intensive radiation, and if accumulated in any large amounts would probably cause structural changes in the fuel element. Simple, or at least practical, economic methods of dealing with this matter will be developed by chemists and metallurgists.

The fact that a great many countries in Europe, India and South America have not sufficient fossil or hydro resources to meet even half of their present day requirements of power, adds an extra incentive to develop nuclear power. Just as grain research has increased our food supply by both improvement in the type and by developing new kinds which will ripen in the further northern latitudes, so research will provide the means of creating economical nuclear power units.

Nuclear Fuel Production—Breeder Reactors

In a reactor using natural uranium, many neutrons are captured by the uranium atoms of mass 238, forming a new unstable element, neptunium. This element soon decays to a much more stable new element, plutonium, which is a very valuable nuclear fuel—both for reactors and for atomic bombs. Hence every uranium reactor produces this new fuel from the non-fissionable uranium 238. If the metal thorium is exposed in a reactor to neutron bombardment, it may be transformed into a fissionable isotope of uranium having a mass 233. Thus, we can, and do, create nuclear fuels from both uranium and thorium. Each nuclear fission on the average releases 2.5 neutrons. One of these is required to keep the reactor operating at its constant power level. One of the remaining 1.5 neutrons might produce an atom of the new nuclear fuel out of the non-fissionable isotope to replace the atom consumed. In other words, the fission of ten atoms of say, unanium 235, will result in the ejection of 25 neutrons. Ten of these are required to fission other 235 nuclei to keep the power constant and ten might be captured by uranium 238 atoms to replace the fuel consumed. This would leave still five neutrons available, some of which will be absorbed by moderator, shields, coolants and reflector and others may escape into the surrounding medium. If a reactor could be designed, so as to conserve one of the remaining neutrons to produce an additional atom of fuel, then we should be gaining more fuel than is consumed. A reactor, which would produce more fuel than it consumes, is called a breeder. Such an experimental breeder has been designed and operated at the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho with indications that breeding is actually occurring. It is what is called a fast neutron type, using a central core of nuclear fuel surrounded with a blanket of uranium in which the nuclear fuel is produced. The coolant, water under pressure, produces steam for operating a turbo-generator. It is thus also a double purpose type of reactor—producing power and fissionable material.

We may expect improvements in such reactors, affording power and producing nuclear fuel from either uranium or thorium or both. As the 0.7% of uranium is the only natural source, the importance of transforming the large amounts of uranium and thorium to nuclear fuel is a very urgent aspect of nuclear reactor design. All countries are interested in such development. The British hope thus to make available enough nuclear fuel in breeder type reactors which will also produce useful power at or near competitive costs, to make up for their estimated deficiency in coal. Besides coal is much more valuable as a source of chemicals than as a heating fuel and should be conserved for that purpose. It is estimated that the world's supply of conventional fuels and hydro is less than half the energy which uranium and thorium deposits could supply. This estimate assumes breeding, which in a quarter century should be in economic operation.

Small "packet" nuclear plants will be designed for providing power in remote isolated places, such as we have in the north of Canada, where mining and small townsites having a limited life have been established. They would provide the necessary electric power for operations and could also produce the necessary heating facilities. Little has as yet been done in designing such units but they could be operated today at rates competitive with the present cost of diesel supplied power in many northern mining camps. They will be made portable, or at least demountable, so as to be used in successive mining operations. They would have the advantage of small fuel requirements, eliminating the difficulty of transporting and storage of large quantities of oil to provide for winter operations, as is necessary in many localities at present.

Since reactors are merely generators of heat, they will undoubtedly be used as central heating plants for large communities. Their use for this purpose replacing coal and oil, will avoid the smoke nuisance which at times not only presents health hazards but destroys the beauty of our cities. If, as we expect, they will be as economical to build and operate as coal or oil-fired boilers for power purposes, they will be even more useful as heating units for large blocks of buildings. Not only will this be possible in cities and towns but also in remote large camps or industrial plants. However, they will not replace the single house furnace unless such heating be tied in with a large central heating scheme for whole blocks. Larger plants are more economical than small reactors and the minimum size is such as to preclude any domestic use.

More Speculative Possibilities

The results of investigations with radioisotopes, design of economic power reactors and breeders, chemical processing and waste disposal, are all short-term developments which will definitely be beneficial in maintaining and raising the standard of living and health in all nations of the world. This assumes that goodwill and faith in the better judgment of man will restore a peaceful world with the release of the huge stock-piles of fissionable weapon material for the creation of useful power. But there are other much greater sources of atomic energy which will eventually be released at controlled rates on this planet, when research unlocks the secrets of how it may be accomplished. This is the thermonuclear reaction in which hydrogen nuclei combine to form helium by a fusion or synthesis process with the release of an enormous amount of energy compared with that obtained from the fission of uranium 235. It is rather interesting that this idea was expounded by the physicist Bethe about 15 years ago, shortly after the discovery of nuclear fission, to explain the source of energy from the sun. He proposed a series of six nuclear reactions in which carbon acted as a catalyst to combine four hydrogen nuclei to form one helium nucleus. Subsequently other reactions were proposed, such as the reaction of a tritium nucleus on a helium nucleus to form a lithium nucleus which acting on hydrogen produces two helium nuclei, with the release of energy. These speculations required exceedingly high temperatures and large quantitis of materials in nuclear form— atoms stripped of their electrons. Such conditions were not available on our planet until the development of the atomic bomb. It requires temperatures of millions of degrees and such conditions are present in a nuclear explosion. Hence, by adding the appropriate ingredients, a thermonuclear reaction was tested and as is well known today, the reaction actually does occur with a very substantial release of energy. When our scientists learn more about how nuclei are held together, the exact nature of the forces and how the various particles besides protons and neutrons are created by cosmic rays and similar energetic incident particles, it is possible that such thermonuclear reactions will be available at less violent rates. The secret of accomplishing this will undoubtedly be found in the future and then our supply of nuclear fuel will be almost unlimited.

The propulsion of ships and airplanes will in the future be performed by nuclear engines but such developments will not be in general use for at least a half century. The warm water from the condensers of turbo-generators attached to nuclear power plants might very well find useful application.

Today we are living in the dawn of nuclear science. Great possibilities and achievements for the welfare and happiness of mankind lie ahead. We, in Canada, may be justly proud of the contribution our scientists and engineers are making to the peaceful applications of atomic energy. The NRX reactor at Chalk River is recognized as that of most advanced design of any known experimental pile and the new NRU one, now under construction, is not only more powerful but has many new features which will enable our scientists to retain a leading role in the greatest development of modern science, opening up new vistas through which gleam the untravelled world, full of hopes and excitement for all to explore. Never before have such possibilities been offered to mankind to improve his health, happiness and intellectual satisfaction as those now available from the future developments in Atomic Energy.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. Arthur E. M. Inwood, a Past President of the Club.

"JAPAN'S POSITION IN THE FAR EAST"

An Address by

HONOURABLE KOTO MATSUDAIRA

Ambassador of Japan to Canada

Thursday, April 14th, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: We are glad to welcome as our speaker today His Excellency the Honourable Dr. Koto Matsudaira, the Ambassador of Japan to Canada, who will speak to us on "Japan's Position in the Far East."

Born in Tokyo 52 years ago, Dr. Matsudaira passed the Diplomatic Service Examinations of Japan in 1926, a year later graduated from the Faculty of French Law of Tokyo University, and then studied in France and took his Doctor of Law degree at the University of Paris, France.

He started his diplomatic career as Attache of the Embassy of Japan, Paris, in 1931, was at two League of Nations' meetings in Geneva and from 1934 to 1941 was with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Tokyo.

Dr. Matsudaira was posted to Washington as First Secretary of the Japanese Embassy only a few months before Pearl Harbour. He was interned there until the exchange of diplomats was arranged in June 1942.

After another period of service in Japan he was posted to Moscow in 1944 and when Russia declared war on Japan in 1945, he was interned a second time.

Following a further period of service with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Dr. Matsudaira was appointed

Ambassador to Canada early last year, arriving just in time to sign a new trade treaty between our two nations.

The international situation in the Far East holds the spotlight of world attention today. We are indeed fortunate to have a distinguished Japanese diplomat who can draw on personal experience in the World capitals of Geneva, Paris, Washington, and Moscow, as well as in Tokyo and Ottawa, to tell us of "Japan's Position in the Far East."

DR. MATSUDAIRA: I consider it a great honour indeed to have been given the privilege of addressing the members of this Club today, because I am well aware of the contribution of your organization in furthering the better and fairer understanding of international affairs, in which, I should like to say, Canada is playing an ever more important part.

I should also like to mention what an honour it is for me to represent my country in Canada.

I understand that you would like to know something about the position of Japan in the Far East today. Before entering into a discussion of this problem, I imagine that it would not be out of place to give you a brief historical background of my country.

In July, 1853, Commodore Perry, commanding four United States' ships, steamed into Tokyo Bay with his fleet of "black ships", as they were called by the Japanese of that day, and opened Japan for trade with the West.

A feudal and medieval Japan thus found herself thrown into a world in which world-wide politics were rife and the struggle for colonial possessions was going on. On the Asiatic mainland was a powerful Chinese Empire. Tsarist Russia was a mighty force in the north. Japan was faced with the necessity of building up her political and economic strength without delay, or else submitting to foreign pressure. Her young, patriotic leaders, therefore, were determined to create a modern Japan, a major power which was to become a worthy member of the family of nations.

The speed with which Japan was transformed into a great, industrial power in just three-quarters of a century can still be regarded as an extraordinary achievement. Western culture, science, industrial techniques and thought took firm roots in a virgin soil. Parliamentary government was established. Japan fought two great wars and emerged victorious. In World War I she was a staunch partner of the Allies.

Thus, in the early 1930's, and in the course of some fifty years, Japan built an Empire, became a world power, signed the Treaty of Versailles as one of the principal allied and associated powers, and was an original member of the League of Nations. Her Empire was prosperous and powerful. Her position as the stabilizing force in the Far East was secure. Then came the day of disaster, revealing to the proud how the day of doom, which may lurk in the destiny of nations and men, can be so close to the day of glory.

Now in what position did Japan find herself when the last Great War ended? She had lost forty-five per cent of her territory and twenty-five per cent of her national wealth. Hundreds of cities were razed and millions of homes were destroyed. Her prosperous colonies and Empire were gone, and her once great merchant fleet no longer existed. And, in the same breath, she lost her traditional markets, as well as her important sources of raw materials.

Now I would like to say a few words about Japan since the war—what her position is in the present state of affairs. I hope that these few words will help you to understand—even in a small and hurried way—the problem of present-day Japan.

Many of you probably noticed the results of the recent general election held in Japan. This election was watched with particular interest by the rest of the world because it gave an indication of the future course of the Japanese people. More than seventy-five per cent of those eligible to vote cast their ballots. Out of four hundred and sixty-seven seats in the House of Representatives, the Democrats, who form one of the conservative political parties headed by Prime Minister Hatoyama, won one hundred and eighty-five. The Liberals, another conservative party, won one hundred and twelve. Together they control an absolute majority in the House. The Communists, who at one time after the war had thirty-five seats, put up seventy-two candidates and only two of them were returned. Their defeat is significant. The Socialists won one hundred and fifty-six seats.

In 1946, thirty-nine women were elected to the House of Representatives, but in the recent election this figure dropped to eight.

The Constitution upholds fundamental human rights. The Diet, which corresponds to your Parliament, is the highest organ of the state. No longer is the Emperor a divine ruler. He is a constitutional monarch, a symbol. The Prime Minister is designated by the Diet. Appointments of the Judges of our Supreme Court are reviewed by the people. Our prefectural governors are elected by popular vote. The rate of illiteracy in Japan has dropped to around three per cent, a figure which I would like to emphasize. Economic reforms have also been instituted. The former powerful Zaibatsu combines have been dissolved. Anti-monopoly legislation has been enacted. Sweeping land reforms have been successfully carried out. At the end of the war, fifty-four per cent of the land was owner-cultivated and forty-six percent tenant cultivated. At the end of 1950, the percentage of the former had risen to eighty-nine percent and that of the latter had dropped to eleven per cent.

After all I have said, I think I should now define the whole problem. What is wrong with Japen? What is the trouble that besets her? What is the difficulty which her leaders must face and tackle without delay?

Japan's fundamental problem is one of population. In an area a little more than two-fifths the size of the Province of Ontario or one-fourth the size of the Province of Quebec live some eighty-six million Japanese. This is the equivalent of more than six times the population of Canada. In Canada you have a density of population of 3.65 persons per square mile. In Japan it is 620 persons per square mile. But far more important is the figure in terms of arable land, 3,422 persons per square mile, the highest in the world! If you had the same density as Japan, you would have an almost unbelievable population—a figure that I think will shock you—two billion, two hundred and sixty-eight million! This is just about the population of the entire world today.

Now, every day, Japan has three thousand new mouths to feed, every month ninety thousand new babies, every year one million more in population, the size of the population of Toronto! At the present rate, Japan's population will reach one hundred million by 1970. Emigration will not help very much. The present plan of the Japanese Foreign Office is to arrange for the emigration of 50,000 in 1956 to the Latin-American countries; the figure for 1954 was 3,500.

We are faced, therefore, with the necessity of finding some means to support our population, that is to say, to maintain and improve the general standard of living and to find new jobs for the rising labour force. We cannot do so with the resources within our own borders. Every bit of arable land in Japan is so intensely cultivated that the meagre soil will produce, per acre, 1.6 times more than that of the United States. But still we are dependent upon imports for about twenty per cent of our minimum food requirements. That represents $600 million in terms of money, or, in other words, half of our export revenue. The only answer, as I see it, is to develop our foreign trade to the utmost in order to earn foreign exchange with which to purchase the food we need. Our industries must be revived and strengthened. There is no country in the world today for which international trade means life or death to such an acute extent than Japan—not even Great Britain.

Since the end of the war, we have been at grips with this difficult problem. The task is not an easy one. The problem has been made even harder by the high cost of production. Our labour costs are no longer low, as they were reputed to be before the war. The whole result is one of impressive instability in our trade balance. In

1952, the deficit in our trade balance amounted to $750 million, in 1953 to $1100 million and in 1954, $1100 million. The deficit was largely alleviated by off-shore procurement by the United States Army in Japan, but still the net unbalance for 1953 was $314 million. In 1952, we could narrowly manage to make both ends meet, thanks to the said off-shore procurement; but now with the Korean War at an end, we can hardly expect to rely on that indefinitely. You might see how precarious is this situation. Nevertheless, a slight improvement is being made and the Finance Ministry was able to announce during the last few days that the foreign exchange balance for 1954 was $344 million in credit. Japan's foreign exchange reserves were $977 million as of December 31, 1953, and $1,180 million as of March 31, 1955.

Let us look for a moment at the trade between Canada and Japan. You may be aware that Japan now ranks as Canada's third best customer — exceeded only by the United States and the United Kingdom—and as Canada's second best customer as far as wheat is concerned. This year, we are spending more than one hundred million dollars in Canada, the majority for wheat, barley and pulp. In 1953, we sold in this country goods to the value of approximately thirteen million dollars, while our purchases from you totalled close to one hundred and two million dollars.

It is our utmost desire to continue and to expand, as far as possible, our growing trade with Canada, for we are convinced that, in this way, not only can we complement the needs of another, but, also, through fair and honest trade, build up and deepen the good understanding between our two peoples. However, I might venture to say, that it is difficult to see how such a one-sided balance can continue indefinitely.

Perhaps the strongest argument for increased and balanced trade between our two countries is that it would be to our mutual benefit, in the long run. It is only through mutually profitable trade that we can improve our respective standards of living. The woodsman in British Columbia, the farmer in Alberta or in Saskatchewan, the wheat grower in Manitoba, depend on a balanced and long-enduring system of trade between us to maintain and improve their individual, personal well-being. By buying more from Japan, you are ensuring the welfare and happiness of their children and of themselves.

It is time now to examine the position of Japan in East Asia. Before the war, and taking the 1934-36 average figures, Japan depended on China to supply 68% of her coal, 36% of her iron ore and 40% of her industrial salt. Japan's exports to China, Korea, Formosa and other neighbouring countries amounted during the same period to an average of 42 per cent of our total annual exports. This has now dropped to 9 per cent, while our exports to Southeast Asia, which amounted to 19 per cent of the total in pre-war years, have now increased to 36 per cent. You will understand how Japan's economy now depends on her trade with Southeast Asia and on the possibilities of its expansion!

If Southeast Asia should go Communist, Japan will not be able to stand alone economically. The fate of Southeast Asia is therefore an object of real and grave concern to us. The political stability and economic development of Southeast Asia, on the other hand, will greatly strengthen Japan politically and economically.

Economics represent a vital element in determining the political future of Southeast Asia. If China under Communist control makes rapid economic progress, leaving the comparatively slow Southeast Asian countries far behind, there will develop a great margin between economic standards in Communist and non-Communist areas of Asia, enabling Communist China to place the whole of Southeast Asia under her influence without resort to arms.

The present per capita national income of Communist China, with a population of 580 million, is estimated to be approximately $50. A similar index for Southeast Asian countries, with a population of 620 million, stands at nearly the same level. (That for Japan was $170 in 1953, still 20 per cent lower than the pre-war level.) Therefore, we may assume that Communist China and

Southeast Asia are on an almost equal level at present. The political future of Asia will be acutely influenced by the extent to which either of these two areas surpasses the other in the attainment of a higher national income.

The scale of capital investment is often a decisive factor in determining the rate of economic development. By our calculation, the funds necessary to execute the now contemplated development plans by the Governments of Southeast Asian countries reach a total of $9.28 billion. It is expected that 37 per cent of the amount will be furnished by foreign investors. The amount of investment per year will be $1.67 billion—$2.6 per capita in relation to the pupulation. On the other hand, total investments made in Communist China during 1953 were, by our calculation also, $5.92 billion—$10 per capita.

In comparing these figures, it must be taken into consideration that while almost all investments in Communist China are necessarily governmental, there is considerable private investment in Southeast Asia. However, total investment in Southeast Asia, even if we increase the above figures to include private investments, and raise the investment per capita to $5. would still remain at about 50 per cent of that of Communist China.

There is still another important factor to be taken into account — Communist China is mobilizing "voluntary labour" for various construction projects.

Under Communist regimes, it may not be difficult to take drastic measures, through government decrees, to force extremely austere living standards on the people and to mobilize surplus labour for construction projects, thus raising the rate of capital formation. This policy is now being followed by Communist China and the effort has been strengthened, particularly since last year.

Considering all this, it may perhaps be said that the actual amount of investment in Communist China is far greater than our estimate.

On the contrary, in Southeast Asia, efforts are being made on the basis of individual freedom. We will have to admit, although reluctantly, that, unless some help is extended, Southeast Asia will be slow in its economic development.

If the difference in investment level now existing between the two camps in Asia is to continue into the future, the per capita national income of Communist China, in ten years' time, will be higher than that of the Southeast Asian countries by 20 to 30 per cent.

It seems to be the prevalent view in western countries that the responsibility for economic development rests entirely upon each individual country, that it is sufficient for advanced countries to give technical aid to under-developed countries, and that economic aid might weaken the spirit of self-reliance. According to this view, it is felt that the supply of necessary capital should be left to the free investment of private enterprisers and that, if under-developed countries wish to invite foreign investments, the most important step for them to take is to eliminate various hindrances to that end. This view is basically sound, I must admit. However, in the light of what has been said before, it is apparent that the supply of capital through government or international banking institutions could be exceedingly helpful and advantageously furnished or enlarged in such basic fields as hygiene, education, transportation, irrigation, power-generation and heavy industries. It would enable those countries to build a foundation on which private enterprises could invest on a commercial basis.

There is one aspect of the problem to which it seems important for me to draw your attention. It is the fact that too hasty overall industrialization of the area is not advisable. We must take into consideration the particular characteristics of the economic structure of this area. I might point out, for example, the following conditions which will result;

1. Industrialization will be unbalanced and "limping" due to the shortage of capital available.
2. Owing to the lack of technicians and to the difficulties in the basic fields I have just mentioned, the products of the newly-developed industries will be, of necessity, high in cost and inferior in quality. They

will not be exportable because of these disadvantages: nor will they be consumable in the local market, where the purchasing power is extremely low.

3. A too hasty investment on a large scale will cause inflation in the area.

The right approach, therefore, must be:

(a) To increase the incomes of the persons engaged in agriculture, thus creating purchasing power in the rural districts which cover practically the whole area.
(b) to encourage the cottage and artisan industries; and
(c) to advance technical education and social welfare, and to improve the conditions in the basic fields, such as transportation, etc., as was said above.

In the Southeast Asian area, to achieve a level of economic development at least equal to that of Communist China, it is, in our view, estimated that a supply of capital amounting to $4 billion annually will be necessary. However, the recent flow of capital into this area from outside, including FOA, World Bank loans, and the Colombo Plan, has been not more than $400 million annually.

One important factor in the promotion of economic development, which should be considered together with a supply of capital, is the urgent need to increase the availability of technicians and skilled workers. In Communist China, for example, during three years up to 1953, the numbers of technical students in the high schools and universities increased to twice their former number, and adult education covering industrial and agricultural techniques has been extended several fold. In the Southeast Asian countries also, the American Point Four Program, the U.N. Expanded Technical Assistance Program, technical assistance based on the Colombo Plan and various other international projects are under way. However, for the most part, these are aimed at providing a high degree of technical knowledge to a limited number of specialists, and are not designed to train large numbers of skilled workers and other minor technicians.

In the above field, Japan also wants to help as far as her financial position permits. We joined the Colombo

Plan last year as a donor nation. We want to begin by expanding the facilities for technical trainees in Japan, and by helping to raise the level of training centres in the Southeast Asian countries themselves.

As for capital investment, Japan wants to help Southeast Asian countries by making payments to them. We agreed to pay to Burma $250,000,000, partly as reparations and partly as a form of economic aid. We also settled Thailand's claim for $41,666,666. We are eager to settle the reparation payments issue with other Southeast Asian countries. The amounts to be paid may not be large when compared with the actual needs of these countries, but we hope they will help them, in some way, in their struggle to better their material way of life.

All of the issues that I have mentioned so far resolve themselves, in one word, into the one main problem of Asia—population.

In Asia, this fundamental problem of population—how to achieve a better standard of living and give jobs to a rising labour force—is attacked by two methods, as I have said. One is communistic, and here looms overwhelmingly the massive and ominous figure of Red China with her boasts of impressive capital investment in her economy, and of tremendous progress in her national life. The other is capitalistic, and here stands Japan as its champion, with her successful record, although disrupted by the destruction of war. The fate of Asia will be decided by whichever one of these methods prevails among the Asian countries. And if Japan fails, all Asia will be lost to the free world.

Japan is situated today at the most strategic and vulnerable point of Free Asia, in what Mr. Stassen calls "The Arc of Free Asia". This extends from Pakistan through India, Burma, Thailand, Malaya, Indonesia, Indochina, The Phillipines and Formosa up to South Korea and Japan. This Arc is formed of fifteen nations. The total population of these fifteen non-communist countries amounts, according to the estimation of Mr. Stassen, to more than 760 million. This is in contrast to what Red

China claims to be her population figure in the latest census—approximately 600 million.

You might notice that in this area outside the Communist sphere there are many millions of human beings who could be called upon to build a world of decent living and of economic prosperity — millions whom the free world can't afford to lose.

Japan used to be the stabilizing force in the Far East. She was a symbol of stability and economic prosperity. The eyes of the teeming millions of Asia used to focus on the achievements and intellectual leadership of this nation. They welcomed the guidance and example of her people.

And today, Japan aspires eagerly to show by her example that economic prosperity can be achieved in Asia through the ideals of freedom and the dignity of man.

As a very successful industrialized nation, Japan is perhaps the only country in this area profoundly convinced of the advantages and merits of the capitalistic system. She has learned from experience that free institutions and private enterprise will bring her a rising material well-being, open outlook and international friendship. She knows also that she owes to this system her, by far, superior standard of living among her fellow Asian nations, notwithstanding the fact that she has a population of eighty-six million. You may notice she has solved, to some extent, her population problem!

It may not be out of place, here, to take a quick glimpse at her present industrial strength.

In 1952, the annual steel output of China was two million tons, India, one million six hundred thousand tons. Japan's six million nine hundred thousand tons were three and a half times greater than the boasted output of Red China and 4.4 times greater than that of industrializing India. You might notice that this figure was taken in 1952 when Japan was still staggering under the crushing blows of the worst defeat in her history. We intend, of course, to rebuild our strength in this field to the pre-war level of 20 million tons. The problem facing the leaders of Japan today is, how and when?

Japan's aspiration to organize a comity of Asian nations based on the anti-communistic creed has not been so far very successful.

Unfortunately, in the aftermath of the war, we are still unable to attain unity of purpose among the free nations of Asia. This lack of unity may be attributed to some extent to the war and, in this regard, we will have to accept, with candour and humility, our responsibilities for damage caused by that war. We are striving hard to promote the relations of goodwill among the nations and men of Asia. But still there are so many obstacles which we must surmount. Lack of strong internal government in some Southeast Asian countries is one of the most formidable obstacles in the way.

An agreement was reached on the 9th of April with Thailand under which Japan will make certain money payments and give some contribution in goods and services to balance the account that Thailand has brought because of the Japanese occupation.

This is yet another large step that Japan has been able to take. As I have mentioned before, an agreement has already been signed and ratified with Burma. Another understanding has been reached with Cambodia. Each one of these agreements has removed a further point of contention.

Japan has still two big reparations problems to solve. Indonesia and The Philippines have their claims and we are trying to find a basis of discussion to bring about a satisfactory settlement.

Thus, as you might see, the normal relations between Japan and her neighbours are gradually being resumed, as I have already mentioned. Friendship among them is important to the recovery and to the future of Japan.

Japan's economic relationship with the Republic of Korea is a very thorny problem. At the present, we have reached a deadlock on the issue. But still we hope that reason and goodwill will prevail, notwithstanding the long history of bitterness.

Thus, I might say, Japan is gradually coming back and I hope that all is for the good of the free world.

In ending my speech, I should like to emphasize one point. That is the position of Japan with the western world. From what I have said you may have deduced one fact. That Japan in the real interpreter of the West to the East, and the East to the West, for she knows and comprehends the western world through her long association and background of personal achievement.

With Japan, I should like to resort to the picturesque image, which Field-Marshal Viscount Mongomery of El-Alamein thought fit to invoke in the case of Canada. Japan also is a hinge standing between the old and new worlds, a hinge of Marco Polo's gold. Maybe indeed it would be better to say, a hinge of jade—encrusted there between two worlds—full of subtle lustre and so fragile!

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. Marvin Gelber.

"OUR COMMON MISSION"

An Address by

JAMES A. FARLEY

Chairman of the Board, The Coca-Cola Export Corporation, and former Postmaster-General of the United States

Thursday, April 21st, 1955

CHAIRMAN: The President, Mr. James H. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: We welcome as our speaker today a man who has been prominent in public life in the United States for over a quarter of a century—Mr. James A. Farley of New York City, Chairman of the Board of The Coca-Cola Export Corporation and a director of the Canadian Coca-Cola Company.

Born 67 years ago at Grassy Point, New York, Mr. Farley started work in 1906, and for 20 years was with the United States Gypsum Company. In 1926 he formed his own firm dealing in mason's materials, which he subsequently merged with five other firms to form the General Builders Supply Corporation of which he was president.

Mr. Farley started his political career 43 years ago by being elected Town Clerk, Stony Point, New York, a post he held for seven years. He was Chairman of the New York State Athletic Commission from 1925 to February 28, 1933, when he resigned to accept an appointment as Postmaster-General of the United States in President Franklin D. Roosevelt's cabinet. Mr. Farley resigned as Postmaster-General on August 31, 1940 and was appointed to his present position of Chairman of the Board of The Coca-Cola Export Corporation.

Mr. Farley held an official position in the Democratic Party as early as 1919. He was Chairman of the New York Democratic State Committee from 1930 to 1944 and was Chairman of the Democratic National Committee from 1932 to 1940.

Outside of the business field, he is a director of Boys' Clubs of America, the Andrew Freedman Home of New York City and a Trustee of the Cordell Hull Foundation and the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation. Mr. Farley has also been greatly interested in the work of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in the United States.

He will speak to us on "Our Common Mission".

MR. FARLEY: You need not be told that it is a privilege and a distinction to address this famous organization. The roster of its members and of its speakers, and the importance of its activities through the years, make it one of the great clubs of this continent. You are particularly kind in inviting me to discuss the mission of our two countries in today's world. Diplomats and scholars are discussing this subject throughout the United States and Canada alike. I can only contribute the observations of a man whose life has followed the paths of practical politics and still more practical business. Yet it is possible that politicians and businessmen as well as students can make a contribution to this, the chief problem of our time.

I think this is the best possible place to offer such a contribution. Throughout the entire world no two great, independent countries have more nearly achieved civilized international relations than have the United States and Canada. If everywhere in the world relations between peoples and governments were carried on as they are between the people and government of Canada and the people and government of the United States, the world's pressing dangers would be met.

Just before World War Two, the German government circulated a piece of propaganda in Washington, arguing that the Germans had a right to make war on Poland to get back the Danzig corridor. So they printed a map of the Canadian-American boundary. They added to Canada a "v"-shaped wedge, cutting off Maine, New Hampshire and part of Massachusetts from the rest of the United States and giving Canada the Port of Boston. Would this not, the German Government asked, necessarily cause war between the two countries? Well, the propaganda dodge fell flat. There is a Canadian wedge pushing south between Lake Huron and Lake Erie. It separates New York and Buffalo from Detroit. We are in that wedge now. Canadian and American trains go across it every night, our common commerce moves by the shortest line without interruption. Another wedge separates Alaska from the rest of America but the Alcan highway crosses it for the mutual pleasure and profit of both of us. Our peoples, and our governments, are far too wise to let either their friendship or their business be interrupted by the border accidents of ancient history.

We share a common resource—the electric power of the magnificent spillway of the St. Lawrence River. We have borne together the costs and the expenses of developing that splendid gift of nature according to a common plan. There are many other illustrations. It is not too much to say that our two nations have attained the highest level of foreign relations known to civilization.

One other factor makes it, I think, not presumptuous for me to claim that we have a common mission. Both our countries are the product of religion and education far more than they are of politics or war. The United States, like Canada, owes its framework chiefly to great Christian movements which have given form to its institutions. Canada, like the United States, owes an enormous debt to its universities and colleges, founded in hope and now grown great. One cannot think of Canada without thinking at once of your own University of Toronto, of Queens, the University of Montreal and McGill, just as one can not think of the United States without thinking also of Harvard, of the University of Notre Dame and of the University of California, and of numberless great and small colleges in between. In both our nations, pioneers built churches and schools. Now in their maturity, both give us the strong red blood which is the life of great democracies.

So we have a common understanding of each other, and from that comes a common mission in world affairs.

I for one am not as happy about the state of world affairs as some who today are writing and speaking about them. Our free world is under pressure. In the next few years, it is likely to be tested as never before. In Europe there is, for the moment at least, an alliance which may serve to hold the Communist powers at bay. But in Asia we have not peace but an armistice resulting from the bloody stalemate of the Korean war and a French defeat in Viet Nam. Both in Indonesia and in Indochina, I am afraid we are slowly losing another major area to Moscow's Chinese partner . . . Still more disturbing, this spring the Colombo Powers with Communist China as the driving force, are holding a conference of some thirty Asiatic and African nations. The Chinese Communists, of course, paraphrase it as a league of "peace". What they mean to do is to create a pro-Communist alliance of all the non-white races against the white races. Their propaganda agents are entirely frank about this. They are frank, too, in insisting that they consider the United States as an enemy. Perhaps you will not disagree if, as an American, I think that an enemy of the United States is necessarily an enemy of Canada just as we consider an enemy of yours an enemy of the United States.

And yet I am sure our two countries will come through the crisis years ahead in quiet, but unquestionable triumph. We shall, I think, make it clear to the world that creative communities of free men make stronger nations and give more to their own people, and to all other peoples, than any other form of organization man has yet devised. We shall not do this by boasting about it, though the boasts are true. We shall not do it by threat to use atomic or other force, though we do have that force. We shall not do it by new and greater scientific discoveries, though it is clear these are already in sight. We shall do it because by successful example at home, and by cool and resolute maintenance of our rights abroad we will inspire whole peoples to follow our course. We will make membership in a free community of nations more attractive and more advantageous than servitude in any Communist empire.

It is not accident that Communism has established no effective bridgehead either in Canada or the United States. The reason is simple: the people of Canada and the people of the United States have already achieved results beyond the wildest promises of Communist dogma. In the light of the achievements of Canadians and Americans, Marxism belongs not in twentieth century politics but in a nineteenth century museum. If, throughout the world, peoples knew that they could live as our peoples do, any Communist empire would promptly begin to contract.

There is evidence that this process is already beginning on Russia's western borders. Hungarians, Poles or Czechs look across the Iron Curtain and wish they were on the side of the free world. The strings in these satellite countries and in East Germany already suggest that Moscow domination there rests now only on besieged and isolated occupation forces; there is no assent of peoples; the promised revolution proved to be only a bloody conquest. To that fact, perhaps, we owe the upsurge of "co-existence" talk which has emanated from Moscow. Now as our two countries, both great trading nations, increase our understanding and wisdom in the ways of foreign commerce, as we find means of assuring that our trade shall benefit other countries as well as ours, we emphasize the clear advantage of the free world system, not by talking but by doing.

This is apparently beginning to be achieved in the West. I am confident it can be achieved in the Far East. The process there will be longer. The task will be larger. Whole populations there have never known freedom; to such people one master is no worse than another; the lot of the coolie is the same in either case. But if a way can be shown by which those masses of coolies can have themselves a stake, however modest, in the miracle of our twentieth century American production, the picture changes. A beginning has been made along these lines in that great archipelago which is today the Philippine

Republic. Canadian enterprise has made a beginning in other parts of the Pacific. Our two countries have worked together towards that end in the less favored countries of Latin America. We can, we should, and indeed we must, make it clear that liberty and prosperity go together and that prosperity is not bought at the price of freedom. After all, Russia, struggling desperately to give her own people the most modest standard of living, is not the country which can introduce to Asia the almost limitless production all Canadians and Americans take for granted.

The word "freedom" is used advisedly. In our countries we speak of democracy. Freedom will very likely find different forms in different countries. Here we are devoted to our own democratic form. We will gladly teach it to any who wish to learn from us. But we cannot impose it, and have no business to try. What we can do is to make clear that the chief end of any government is the development of free men in a system by which they work together. Each people has its own wisdom about its own affairs. Probably even the most backward people can teach us something. Their ways are not our ways. But we will be well advised to work with them within the forms which they themselves know and understand.

In thus working for a peace which shall be real and not a double-talk mockery, both of us must increasingly work together and with other nations. Canada was among the first signers of the "Declaration by United Nations" on January 1, 1942, which foreshadowed the United Nations organization of today. Sometimes we falter in using that great organization well; but it remains the frame of our hope of the world to be, a world of peace, under law, guaranteeing freedom from fear to the world.

Combined our two countries constitute in present fact the largest and strongest single regional group in the free world. There are others like it, notably the British family of nations, whether called "Empire" or "Commonwealth" and the Atlantic group we call NATO. In building these as we have, we cannot forget that, at long last, statesmanship must bring them all into harmony. This is not theory.

In Montreal are the headquarters of the International Civil Aviation Organization, a United Nations agency. Because of it a Canadian pilot leaving Toronto knows he will find the same signals, the same language, the same rules for landing or leaving in Paris or Bombay or Manila that he has in his home airport. This is a measure of real, tangible peace. The time must come when the major human necessities are dealt with as is common-sense co-operation as has been worked out in the air.

Our purpose must be to work toward this goal of world peace and world civilization without war. We know, of course, that this is not wholly our choice.

Such information as we have indicates that the Communist Government in China is giving considerable thought to starting a war this year for the purpose of seizing Formosa. The American Government has made it clear that the United States will resist if this happens. In my judgment, the United States Government can do nothing else. Failure to resist an armed attack on Formosa would merely mean Communist conquest there, and within a few months we should have to fight somewhere else. Even in this grim picture there is still a respectable possibility of limiting the war so that it does not become general. Modern war is so horrible and its results so unpredictable that I do not think any sane group can adopt war as a policy as did Hitler in 1939. Yet, in any event, between us we must maintain such strength that no one will dare challenge with force, or assume that counter-force does not exist. No one can guarantee success in the field of foreign relations, but we shall try for peace and keep on trying and I do not despair of success. In this task, as an old politician, let me suggest that the men running foreign affairs—the men in our State Department and your Department of External Affairs—need all the help and support you and I can give them, whether we are of their political faith or not. They are working amid tremendous hazards and their burden is greater than any in recorded history.

Are we starry-eyed in thinking that the task of bringing a reasonable measure of peace to the world may be accomplished in the coming generation? Perhaps, but the example of Canada makes me believe it can be done. Your country was born of diverse races with different languages. History insisted they were sworn enemies, and you refused to accept that decree. You had to build a nation out of different civilizations, customs and religions. Beyond possible expectation, you nobly accomplished that task. In my own time your great Prime Minister, Mackenzie King, a Scot, steadily worked with Canadians of French ancestry, religion and custom. I have no doubt that his brilliant successor, Prime Minister St. Laurent, of French ancestry, no less carefully works with his countrymen of English stock. With patience, tolerance and common-sense you made a union when elsewhere in the world race rivalries, disorder and hatred were the order of the day. In my own country Irish and English, Italians, Germans, Jews and Negroes have steadily moved towards union so that today Americans, the most composite population in the world, are also the most unified. We have done in North America what has not been achieved in any other part of the world.

In virtue of these achievements, Canada and America can claim the privileges, as they must assume the burdens of a common mission. We must enter upon it without superiority. And, with faith, we can justifiably draw assurance and strength from awareness of solid results already attained. "To each and all our equal lamp at peril of the sea", wrote Kipling of the English coastwise lights. No less great is the guiding fire of the fellowship of two great nations in a dangerous but splendid time.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. John W. Griffin, a Past President of the Club.

“ANNUAL MEETING”

Thursday, April 28th, 1955

PRESIDENT’S REPORT: This is the annual meeting of our Club for the year 1954-55. The constitution provides that the President shall submit a report of the year’s proceedings to the annual meeting, including an interim financial report. The Club’s audited financial statement for the year is published in the Year Book.

Our total estimated income for the year was $10,390, and estimated disbursements totalled $9,950, leaving a small surplus of about $440.

Our membership now totals 2,085, an increase of only 33 from a year ago. There were 256 new members enrolled in the year, but we lost 223 members through death or for other reasons.

During this current season we held twenty-seven regular meetings. Attendance has averaged 256 per meeting or about 12½% of our total membership.

A breakdown of our speakers by countries of permanent residence, shows that fifteen were from Canada, eight from Great Britain, three from the United States, and one from Japan. This has given us a good cross-section of speakers with diversified and interesting subjects.

It is with deep regret that I record the death of our Past President—Mr. J. F. M. Stewart—and of our pianist and veteran member of our executive—Mr. Harry Bourlier.

It is always difficult and sometimes unfair to mention specific names in recording special thanks and appreciation, but I would be remiss in not making special mention of Mr. Ernest Miles, our Secretary and Mr. Walter Comber, C.A., our Honorary Treasurer, who continue to be two pillars of this club.

Our thanks are also due to Mr. Frank B. McGillion, who has taken over playing “The Queen” for us, despite the fact that it has not always been easy for him to attend these meetings.

I also wish to express the thanks of the Club to the Royal York Hotel and, particularly to Edward Hadley, for the efficient and helpful service given us at our meetings.

May I also express to all the members of the Executive your appreciation for their hard work and devotion to the welfare of the Club. The success of The Empire Club of Canada depends on the enthusiastic public spirited efforts of all the members of your executive who give generously of their abilities and their time for no other reward than the satisfaction of seeing a job well done.

In conclusion, I acknowledge my personal indebtedness to each member of the executive for their unfailing help, their ready encouragement and their loyal support. I wish also to thank all the members of this great club most sincerely for the generous measure of encouragement and the never failing courtesy and tolerance shown to me. It has been a privilege and an honour to have been the President of The Empire Club of Canada.

I will now ask Mr. R. A. Stapells who was President of the Club in 1919-20 and who is Chairman of the Nominating Committee to present his Committee's report.

MR. STAPELLS: As Chairman of the Nominating Committee, it is my privilege to report that your committee recommends the following gentlemen as officers and executive members of The Empire Club of Canada for the 1955-56 season.

President: Dr. Cecil Charles Goldring, M.A., D.Paed.

Born in Whitby, Ontario, Dr. Goldring is recognized as one of the outstanding educationalists in Canada. He has been connected with Toronto schools since 1912 as a teacher, a principal, as Inspector of Schools from 1927 to 1932, then as Superintendent of Schools for 13 years, and since 1945, as Director of Education.

In addition, Dr. Goldring has been actively identified with many important educational, civic and community organizations.

The excellent work that he has done for this club over the years has indeed earned him the honour of being president, and this club is fortunate in having Dr. Goldring as its new president.

First Vice-President: Donald H. Jupp, O.B.E.
Second Vice-President: Lt. Col. W. H. Montague, O.B.E., E.D.
Third Vice-President: Bruce J. Legge.
Secretary: Ernest Miles.
Hon. Treasurer: W. W. Comber, C.A.
Hon. Secretary: R. Ford Ralph.
Asst. Secretary: Dr. Clarence B. Crummey.
Hon. Auditor: H. T. Jamieson, F.C.A.

Members of the Executive Committee:
Douglas Best
Russell W. Buyers
Controller F. Joseph Cornish, Q.C.
S. S. Fletcher
Marvin Gelber
Warren B. Hastings
Lt. Col. N. D. Hogg, M.B.E., E.D.
H. R. Jackman
J. Palmer Kent, Q.C.
H. R. Lawson
Harold Menzies
Z. S. Phimister
David J. Roche
Brig. W. S. Rutherford
A. G. Sculthorpe
Bredin Stapells
Alexander Stark, Q.C.

Immediate Past President: James H. Joyce.

Past Presidents: D. H. Gibson, C.B.E.
John W. Griffin
Arthur E. M. Inwood

I nominate these gentlemen for the offices named. (The motion was duly seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: As the number of gentlemen just nominated does not exceed the number of offices and executive members permitted by the Constitution, I instruct the Secretary to cast one ballot for the election of these gentlemen.

The Secretary has just handed me his ballot so I declare those nominated are elected as officers and members of the Executive Committee for 1955-56.

"COMMONWEALTH TRADE AND BEYOND"

An Address by

WALTER TAPLIN, ESQ.

Former editor of "The Spectator"

MR. JOYCE: We welcome as our speaker today Mr. Walter Taplin, who was recently appointed by the British Broadcasting Corporation to act as an advisor on economic affairs and to produce programs on economic subjects.

Mr. Taplin has acquired a very sound reputation as a broadcaster and commentator on international affairs, having been heard regularly on the B.B.C.'s European and North American Services.

Born in Southampton 44 years ago, Mr. Taplin graduated in Commerce from University College, Southampton, and then took his degree in politics, philosophy and economics at Queen's College, Oxford.

After a period as tutor-organizer for Adult Education in West Hampshire and East Dorset, he joined the staff of *The Economist*, London, in 1936 as an Assistant Editor, dealing mainly with home economic affairs.

During the war Mr. Taplin served in the Food Import Branch of the Ministry of Food and then in the office of the War Cabinet. In 1945 he was a member of the British Delegation to the Reparations Conference in Paris.

After the war, Mr. Taplin returned to *The Economist* for a short time, but left to become Assistant Editor of *The Spectator*. He was appointed Editor in 1953, but left in 1954 when the newspaper changed hands.

Mr. Taplin will speak to us on "Commonwealth Trade and Beyond".

MR. TAPLIN: Gentlemen, as you have heard, I am to speak on "British Commonwealth Trade and Beyond", and I want to make this the opportunity for an analysis of the nature of British Commonwealth trade and of the elements in British Commonwealth trade. If I say a number of things which are completely familiar to you, I hope you will be patient with that, because I hope to come on, ultimately, to something a little new.

I think it is essential at this time, first of all, to be clear on just exactly what the main elements in the basic idea of Commonwealh trade are. Now, of these elements I will take, first of all, the historically fundamental, but extremely crude idea of economic imperialism. This, historically, is the concept with which the whole thing begins. It begins with the first plantations which were based on the straightforward but not entirely admirable ideas of subduing native populations, using the resources of the countries thus subdued for the benefit of the home country, and quite often for the personal benefit of absentee owners.

This, I say, is a very simple, very crude and not admirable idea. In fact, it is not even an economically effective means of organization. The development of economic imperialism has been away from that idea toward more enlightened concepts.

Development away from that idea was pretty continuous until the 19th century when Britain had in effect reached the opposite extreme. The dominant idea about the British Empire in the 19th century—that century in which Britain became, through overseas trade, the wealthiest country in the world—the dominant idea of Empire trade in that century was that the countries of the Empire were, far from being assets, something of a liability, even a positive nuisance. The great traders of the 19th century built up British wealth on a principal of free trade and of no interference. The idea that government could intervene to promote certain types of relationship between the countries of the Empire was not one which was popular with the vast majority of traders and business men in the last century. They had built up their British wealth on free trade. They were accused, by the end of the century when the idea of Empire had begun to revive, of having acquired the British Empire in a fit of absence of mind.

Now, by the end of the century, ideas were beginning to change. We had entered the era what is called the "New Imperialism" and we had something of a reaction back towards closer economic ties between the countries of the Empire, ultimately strengthened by the force of the Government itself.

This phase which got going in the last quarter of the last century, was continuous and I think reached its peak or, if you like, its lowest point, in the Ottawa Agreements of 1932. These Agreements, as you know, were agreements giving certain exclusive advantages to the countries of the Commonwealth in their trading with each other. These Agreements were the product of depression. They were the product of a state of mind in which individual countries, and where possible groups of countries, tried to save themselves from the fury of economic storm. They were agreements to ensure protection for the industries and some of the extractive activities of the Commonwealth, and I would say that once you moved away from circumstances of depression, the Ottawa Agreements were bound to fail. They were, in fact, particularly inappropriate in an atmosphere of trade expansion and from the middle of the '30s we had the growth of such an atmosphere, so that these Agreements just faded away and tended to become less effective because circumstances did not suit them.

In fact, we got back into the main stream of development of economic imperialism, that is to say the stream which runs away from the idea of close economic and political association for trading purposes, and toward greater freedom in trading relationships.

In the Ottawa Agreements there is in fact an interruption in the long historical process away from the crude idea of economic imperialism, which I outlined in the beginning. I would say—and this is my personal opinion—at this moment economic imperialism is dead. Or, if it lives at all, it only lives in the mind of Lord Beaverbrook. I would say that if there is a danger in economic relationships at the moment, where the Commonwealth is concerned, it is not danger of imperialism, but a danger of the opposite, of what I would call unimperialism.

Now, I may be very reactionary in this respect, but I think one of the more appealing statements made by Sir Winston Churchill, in the course of his many great statements, was the one in which he said that he had not become His Majesty's First Minister to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire.

That gives me a fine sentiment. It is perfectly simple to see what dangers can arise from a misinterpretation of that statement. But the correct interpretation is one which sees danger in withdrawing too quickly, in assuming too readily that the Commonwealth has no contribution to make to the welfare of the world. We must remember in any analysis of Commonwealth trading relationships that we have developed away from economic imperialism. Don't let us develop away too far into unimperialism—to nothingness in the economic relationships of the Commonwealth.

That is the first element in Commonwealth trade, as I am attempting to describe it, by an analytical method.

Now, let us turn to the second element which also has its roots pretty deep in history, which is a completely different idea from that of economic imperialism. This is the idea which we call colonial development—the idea that we are interested in the welfare of colonial territories. We are interested in the economic and political life of colonial territories, in order that they may in due course stand on their own feet.

I am using the word "colonial" (which is a rather dangerous word) in the strict legal sense. I am referring to those parts of the Commonwealth which are still under the direction of the British Government through the Colonial Office in London. The term "colonial" in its present application applies only in that limited sphere. I don't include any of the major parts of the Commonwealth. I don't include Canada. I hope that makes me safe for the rest of this talk.

Now, the idea of colonial development is something more than mere paternalism. It is not simply a matter of looking after children, but rather the idea of looking to the economic and social health of the colonial territories in order that ultimately they may achieve economic and political independence.

This is a policy which has been pursued for many years has reached a high stage of development in the case of the Gold Coast which now has, in addition to considerable economic strength of its own, a political organization which gives a very large degree of self-government.

The same thing may apply in due course to the West Indies, where there is a movement toward Federation which is being actively encouraged by the British Government.

The idea of colonial development, I would say, is an idea which at this moment is in high fashion in Britain. We have heard more talk about this development. We have had more action in the sphere of development in the post-war period than we have had for many years before that. It is the subject of competition between the two main political parties—a competition to see which party can spend the most. There is no shortage of funds. There has been no question of any kind of exploitation of the colonial areas, but rather the reverse. The entire background has been one of concern about their welfare, in the hope that in the long run there will be more concrete economic results.

This is, as I say, the fashionable atmosphere in British politics at this moment, and clearly it extends well beyond the sphere of the British Government or the Commonwealth as a whole. It is, in fact, given a very high place and very heavy emphasis in the plans of the United Nations. The development side of the United Nations organization is very active and its aim is greater service to the undeveloped countries throughout the world.

I think you can put this under the general heading of what I call colonial development. I wouldn't be put off by the fact that among some of the countries to which this aid is given the word "colonialism" is used as a term of abuse.

I think colonialism is a very good thing, and I think it will be many years before we can dispense with the idea of aid from more developed countries to the less developed countries throughout the world.

The size and character of investment in colonial countries has changed. Before the war it was mostly private investment. It was kept going by Commonwealth assistance during the war. There are still welfare funds and government agencies for pumping money into colonial territory, and there are public boards which undertake to underwrite investments in projects in colonial territories which are a little too risky to attract private capital in the ordinary way. Colonial development schemes can also supply more solid foundations for anyone wishing to undertake commercial investment.

The proportion of the money now going from Britain into colonial territories for background services—education, welfare, social expenditures—is a very high proportion, higher than ever before.

Now, this is the second element in my analysis of the major Commonwealth trade. This you can set in sharp contrast to the first element of economic imperialism. Economic Imperialism and Colonial Development—they are two different ideas, but both fitting into the concept of Commonwealth trade.

Third of these elements in the analysis, I would put the slightly more complex idea—slightly more complex both in nature and extent—which we call the Sterling Area. There have been many attempts to explain the sterling area in words of one syllable. I will try to describe as far as I can in general terms what the sterling area is.

Up to 1931 it was very easy to define what the sterling area was. Up to 1931, when we in Great Britain came off the gold standard for the last time, the sterling area and the world were the same thing. Gold and sterling were interchangeable freely, and London was the financial center of the world. Countries throughout the world, whatever their local circumstances were, found it convenient to keep their bank balances for international trade in the City of London. The City of London was the banking center of the world. The bank balances were held there in sterling because all the countries wanted it that way. That was the way they preferred it. It was a perfectly voluntary arrangement. All the cities of the world treated London as a banking center and kept their balances there.

I said this was the situation until 1931 when Britain went off the gold standard for the last time. Most of you know Britain had gone off the gold standard before that. In fact, Britain was off from the beginning of 1919 until 1925 when the Chancellor of the Exchequer at that time (not a very successful Chancellor of the Exchequer—Winston Churchill was his name) put us back on the gold standard. When we were off the gold standard, London still, despite that, continued to function as the banking center of the world. Since 1931 this situation has changed. The number of countries which are willing to treat London as this banking center has been reduced. The holdings of the gold resources of the world has been switched across to this side of the Atlantic and we now draw a distinction between the sterling area and the dollar area. Today the sterling area consists, roughly speaking, of the Commonwealth, minus Canada (because Canada is a dollar country) and plus one or two small miscellaneous countries which are not in the Commonwealth — Iraq, Lebanon, Iceland, and, believe it or not, the Republic of Ireland. Membership in the sterling area is based on free will, for what else could make the Republic of Ireland a member of any organization with its headquarters in London?

Now, I am saying the sterling area is based upon free will. It is a banking arrangement, voluntarily entered into by certain countries of the world, most of them Commonwealth countries. Perhaps I am overstressing this slightly. If I could introduce a qualification, I would introduce one in the terms of George Orwell's satirical work, "Animal Farm"—that farm in which "All the animals were equal, except that some of the animals were more equal than others."

In this case I think you could draw such a distinction between, for example, Australia, on the one hand, and Jamaica, on the other. I would say Australia has got a bigger pull in the sterling area's control than has Jamaica. Australia has more weight and is more willing to throw it about.

But Australia, if I may introduce a little elementary geography, is different from Jamaica. It needs less help than Jamaica. The situation must be admitted but there is no need to apologize for it. But I think those colonies which may not have quite as much say as the other members of the sterling area as to how exactly the balances are controlled, are still net gainers. It is a banking transaction—they lend what sterling they earn to the bank, just as you would keep your balance, if any, in a bank here in Toronto. The colonial territories only lend, only deposit, the money with the bank, but as a net result of the total colonial relationship, they are gainers, for they are given aid, through colonial development and welfare. This does not apply to Australia. It does apply to Jamaica.

Now, let us turn from this idea of the sterling area, this voluntary banking arrangement, which is part of the Commonwealth organization at the moment, to one other idea—that of the Colombo Plan. Now, the Colombo Plan is to help certain countries of Southeast Asia that are in some danger of slipping into the Communist camp. By means of certain aid to these countries we are building them up economically so they will realize the danger of going over to the Communist camp. So there is an ulterior motive to aid to these countries. It is not aid for the sake of aid, but aid with an end in view. It is not confined to the Commonwealth. It includes countries such as Burma, which is no longer a member of the Commonwealth; the remnants of Indo-China, formerly a French overseas territory; Indonesia, formerly a Dutch area; and at the investing end there is the United States of America as well as Britain.

The Colombo Plan is sometimes represented as a purely Commonwealth device. I have heard it so described during my recent visit to the United States. But you can only make sense of the statement that it is a Commonwealth device by assuming the United States has come back into the Commonwealth. This scheme, the Colombo Plan, if it is successful, leads not only to economic self-help, but to self-defence and resistance to Communism.

Now, I would not go so far as to say that the dominant motive for the Colombo Plan is a new form of imperialism. Don't let us bring that in. But I think it would be safe to say there is not unimperialism about the Colombo Plan. The idea is to treat the free world, dominated by the Western Powers, as a unit, and to bring certain wavering countries more solidly into that unit. That, I say, is not imperialism but, fortunately, it is free from the taint of unimperialism, from the open door policy, whereby anybody can go in the direction of Communism. The idea is that these countries shall remain in the free world and not go in the direction of Communism.

Those are the elements in the analysis—Economic Imperialism; Colonial Development; the Sterling Area; and the Colombo Plan. I think you will see the sort of development which this implies. It is a development whereby the boundaries of the Commonwealth are becoming in the economic sphere more vague, less clearly defined than they used to be,—a development as you move on from the older elements to the idea of the Colombo Plan, toward a situation in which you are not dealing with the entire Commonwealth. Certain parts are excluded in certain respects—such as Canada, which is excluded from the sterling area. And you have certain elements in the Colombo Plan which are not in the Commonwealth at all. We are moving toward, in this description of the uncertain boundaries of the Commonwealth, a new economic situation.

Now, we know we have already moved a long way toward this economic phenomenon. And corresponding with the vagueness of its boundaries is a certain vagueness about its name. We used to call it the British Empire. Then we seemed slightly nervous about that and we began to call it the British Commonwealth and Empire. Then we began to call it the British Commonwealth. The late King George VI once called it the British Commonwealth of Nations. Now, we call it the British Commonwealth. Where do we go from here? We don't know quite now. But at least I am glad to see that an Empire Club still exists here in Toronto.

Well, now consider the movement towards a new economic situation. We have a sterling area which does not coincide in its boundaries with the Commonwealth. We have the Colombo Plan, which does not coincide with the Commonwealth. It is something which has just happened. And you can't do violence to economic development by mere political interference, by painting certain areas on the map in red. That doesn't settle the question at all. When you are dealing with the Commonwealth as an economic entity there is a shading into the other colours. There is the movement toward freer trade in the world from which the Commonwealth cannot stand aside.

I would also say that political health helps to produce economic health and therefore you cannot expect a country which is economically unsound to move automotically in the direction of sound political ideas.

But even if political health did not presuppose economic health, we would still be wise to try to lay a sound economic foundation in every possible country in the world. In many undeveloped countries it is true you find a resistance to economic development. You find the use of "colonialism" as a word of abuse among the countries of Southeast Asia. You find countries which have aspirations which are social and political, and not in a major sense economic at all. They want to be not so much rich as free—free even to go Communist. That seems to me to be going beyond the legitimate boundaries of political freedom. I think they have to be shown that political freedom can, and in many cases does, rest upon the economic foundation.

I would say, as a generalization, that the greatness of Canada and of the United States is very intimately connected with their productvity and their great powers of expansion in the economic field. And I think you envisage a similar connection in some of the undeveloped countries of the world. There is a connection between prosperity and political freedom. But it can't be assumed that political enlightenment in underdeveloped countries will follow automatically from economic aid. Trade, to be successful, must be free, as far as possible, from restrictions. The freer you keep it the more likely you are to demonstrate the success of economic expansion.

This is the thing which makes it so difficult to put any economic boundary around the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth economic boundaries seem to me to be breaking down. This does not mean that the Commonwealth is breaking down. Far from it. I think the Commonwealth relation is becoming stronger. But if it is to survive, and I think it will survive, it will survive not so much because of the economic links within the Commonwealth for these are giving place to a freer association. It will survive not so much as an economic phenomenon as a political phenomenon.

I think we still have a number of ideas about freedom, and free living together in peace with each other, which are worth while putting before the rest of the world. They are worth while keeping well to the forefront in our own daily attitude, our thinking as to the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth has its economic links, but I think they have to take second place to the political and spiritual links. For if the Commonwealth doesn't survive as a political association of free men, then it doesn't survive at all.

THANKS OF THE MEETING were expressed by Mr. Donald H. Jupp, the Third Vice-President of the Club.

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA, TORONTO, ONTARIO
REPORTS AND ACCOUNTS

30th April, 1955

The President and Members of the Executive Committee,
The Empire Club of Canada,
Toronto, Ontario.

GENTLEMEN,

We have examined the books and accounts of The Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, Ontario, and have prepared and attach hereto a Statement of Receipts and Payments for the year ended 30th April, 1955.

We report thereon as follows:—

Membership Fees:

We are satisfied that, in total all 1954-55 fees receivable from Members on record as in good standing as at 30th April, 1955 have been accounted for. Life Membership Fees received during the fiscal years 1953, 1954 and 1955 totalled $375.00 of which, at 30th April, 1955, $187.50 had not been invested in Government Bonds as required by the Agreement reached at a meeting of the Officers and Committee Members of the Executive held on 15th April, 1953.

Membership Roll:

Following is a summary of the Membership Roll for the year:—

	Resident	*Non-Resident*	*Corporate*	*Honorary and Life*	*Total*
Membership Roll as at 30th April, 1954	1,929	98	-	25	2,052
Net Increase or Decrease	35	2	-	1	36
Membership Roll as at 30th April, 1955	1,964	100	-	24	2,088

The Treasurer has certified that the Roll as at 30th April, 1955 contained 2,088 Members as above.

Payments:

All payments made during the year were duly authorized by the Executive Committee.

Liabilities:

Mr. H. R. Lawson, the Chairman of the Finance Committee, has certified that there were no outstanding accounts as at 30th April, 1955.

Fidelity Bond:

Mr. W. W. Comber, the Treasurer, is bonded for $1,000.00.

Insurance:

Office Furniture is covered by a fire insurance policy in the amount of $485.00.

Acknowledgment:

We express our appreciation of the courtesy and assistance extended to us by the Treasurer during the course of our audit.

Reported by,

H. T. JAMIESON LEMAY & COMPANY,
CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS,
Honorary Auditors.

THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT

RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30TH APRIL, 1955

Cash on Hand and in Bank as at 30th April, 1954				$2,804.99
Current Receipts:				
Membership Fees		$10,238.00		
Proceeds of Sale of Year Books		8.75		
Interest:				
On Investments	$ 51.00			
On Bank Balance	101.75	152.75	$10,399.50	
Current Payments:				
Luncheon Expenses net of proceeds of sale of tickets		$ 958.67		
Honoraria:				
Secretary	$800.00			
Treasurer	300.00	1,100.00		
Miscellaneous Expenses		259.65		
Printing, Stationery and Postage		3,574.39		
Printing 1953-54 Year Book		3,239.41		
Recording and Publicity		258.80		
Speakers' Fees and Expenses		458.50		
Telephone and Telegraph		151.23	10,000.65	
Excess of Current Receipts over Current Payments				398.85
Cash on Hand and in Bank as at 30th April, 1955				$3,203.84

We report that we have examined the books and accounts of The Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, Ontario, for the year ended 30th April, 1955 and have obtained all the information and explanations we have required, and that, in our opinion, the above Statement shows correctly the Receipts and Payments of the Club for the year ended 30th April, 1955.

In addition to the Cash Balance of $3,203.84 the Club held at 30th April, 1955, $1,700.00 Par Value Dominion of Canada 3% Bonds maturing 1st September, 1966.

At 30th April, 1955 the Club was committed to publish the 1954-55 Year Book at an estimated cost of $3,250.00.

H. T. JAMIESON LEMAY & COMPANY,
CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS,
Honorary Auditors.

Toronto, Ontario.
8th July, 1955.

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1955-56

Honorary President: FIELD MARSHAL THE RIGHT HONOURABLE EARL ALEXANDER OF TUNIS

Officers:

President: DR. C. C. GOLDRING
First Vice-President: DONALD H. JUPP, O.B.E.
Second Vice-President: LT. COL. W. H. MONTAGUE, O.B.E., E.D.
Third Vice-President: BRUCE J. LEGGE
Secretary: ERNEST MILES
Hon. Treasurer: W. W. COMBER, C.A.
Hon. Secretary: R. FORD RALPH
Asst. Secretary: DR. CLARENCE B. CRUMMEY
Hon. Auditor: H. T. JAMIESON, F.C.A.

Executive Committee:

DOUGLAS BEST
RUSSELL W. BUYERS
CONTROLLER F. JOSEPH CORNISH, Q.C.
S. S. FLETCHER
MARVIN GELBER
WARREN B. HASTINGS
LT. COL. N. D. HOGG, M.B.E., E.D.
H. R. JACKMAN
J. PALMER KENT, Q.C.
H. R. LAWSON
HAROLD MENZIES
Z. S. PHIMISTER
DAVID J. ROCHE
BRIGADIER W. S. RUTHERFORD
A. G. SCULTHORPE
BREDIN STAPELLS
ALEXANDER STARK, Q.C.

Immediate Past President:

JAMES H. JOYCE

Past Presidents:

D. H. GIBSON, C.B.E.
JOHN W. GRIFFIN
ARTHUR E. M. INWOOD

CONSTITUTION

INSTITUTED 1903

THE OBJECT OF THE CLUB IS THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE INTERESTS OF CANADA AND A UNITED EMPIRE

Organization of the Club and Branches

Art. 1.—(1) The organization shall be called The Empire Club of Canada.

(2) Branches of the club may be established with the authority of the Executive Committee, and subject to such conditions and regulations as may from time to time be decided upon by the Club in Toronto.

(3) A committee may be appointed under the provisions of sub-section 2, article 1, for the establishment of branches of the Club, and the word "Unit" shall denote a Branch.

Classes of Members

Art. 2.—The Membership of the Club shall consist of

(a) Active Resident Members,
(b) Non-Resident Members,
(c) Life Members,
(d) Honorary Members,
(e) Associate Members,
(f) Corporate or Sustaining Members.

All members must be of the full age of sixteen years, and members of classes (a), (b), (c), (d) and (f) must be British subjects.

Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Members

Art. 3.—(1) Candidates for Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Membership shall be proposed and seconded by two members of the Club in good standing, and shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of those present at any meeting of the Executive Committee.

(2) Subject to sub-section 4 of this article Active Resident and Associate members shall pay an annual fee of $5.00 and Non-Resident members $3.00, payable on or

before the first day of October in each year. Payment of such fees shall entitle each member to receive a copy of the Year Book. No member in arrears for fees or dues shall be considered in good standing or be eligible for office.

(3) Associate members shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

(4) Members whose applications for membership are received after the first day of April in any year shall pay one annual fee only in respect of the period from that time till the 30th day of September in the following calendar year.

Life Members

Art. 4.—(1) Life Members, not exceeding ten in any one year, may be elected from time to time, at an open meeting of the Club, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee. Provided, however, that Ministers of the Federal Parliament and Premiers of the different Provinces of the Dominion of Canada may be eligible for election at any time, even though their election may cause the number of Life Members to exceed ten in one year.

(2) Life Members shall pay a fee of $75.00 in one sum.

Honorary Members

Art. 5.—(1) Honorary Members may be elected upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, and at a general meeting of the Club.

(2) Honorary Members shall be exempt from the payment of fees, but shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

Corporate or Sustaining Members

Art. 5A—Any company, partnership or business organization shall be eligible for election as a Corporate or Sustaining Member. Applicants shall be proposed by two Active Resident Members of the Club in good standing and the application shall contain the name and position of the Officer nominated by the Applicant as its Candidate for membership. The Applicant and its Nominee shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of those present at any meeting of the Executive Committee. A Sustaining or Corporate Member shall pay an annual fee of $50.00 which shall include the fee of its representative member.

Officers to be Elected

Art. 6—(1) The officers of the Club shall consist of an Honorary President; a President; First, Second and Third Vice-President; an Honorary Treasurer, or a Treasurer, or both; an Honorary Secretary or a Secretary, or both; an Executive Committee which shall consist of the officers appointed under this Article and 17 other members, who, with the officers, shall be elected by ballot, and of the ex-officio members hereinafter mentioned. There may also be elected an Assistant Secretary and Assistant Treasurer. Three Past Presidents together with the immediate Past President shall be the ex-officio members of the Executive Committee for the ensuing year.

Election of Officers

(2) The election of Officers of the Club shall take place at a general meeting of the members, to be held not later than April 30 of each year, at a date to be decided upon by the Executive Committee, and this meeting shall be deemed to be the Annual Meeting. The Officers and Executive Committee then elected shall hold office until April 30th, of the following year, and thereafter until their successors respectively have been duly elected and installed. A Nominating Committee consisting of five members of the Executive Committee and four other members (this Committee shall select its own Chairman) shall be appointed by the Executive Committee and approved at a regular or special meeting of the Club not less than four and not more than six weeks before such Annual Meeting, due notice of such regular or special meeting to be given to all members in good standing, and such Committee shall report to the Annual Meeting. If nominations do not exceed the number of the officers and members of the Executive Committee necessary under the

Constitution, the President shall instruct the Secretary to cast one ballot in favour of those so nominated and thereupon such persons shall be declared by the President to have been duly elected.

(3) An Auditor or Honorary Auditor shall be elected at each Annual Meeting.

Standing Committees

(4) Standing Committees shall be appointed as follows:

(a) Budget and Finance Committee.
(b) Speakers' Committee.
(c) Membership Committee.
(d) Constitution Committee.
(e) Luncheon and Reception Committee.
(f) Publicity Committee.
(g) Year Book Committee.

Filling of Vacancies Among Officers

Art. 7.—In the event of an office becoming vacant by death, resignation, or otherwise, the vacancy thus caused shall be filled by the Executive Committee and the person so chosen shall hold office until the next Annual Meeting.

Duties of Officers

Art. 8.—The duties of the Officers shall be those customary to such positions in similar organizations.

Holding of Meetings

Art. 9.—(1) The Club shall hold general meetings weekly, if possible, from October to April, both inclusive, in each twelve months with such intermissions as from time to time may be decided upon.

(2) At the Annual Meeting a report of the year's proceedings and work shall be submitted by the President, and this report shall be accompanied by an interim report from the Treasurer. An audited statement of the finances of the Club for the full financial year shall be published in the Year Book.

Notice of Meetings

Art. 10.—Written or printed notices of all meetings shall be given to the members of the Club. Such notices shall be sufficient if addressed to the members, and deposited post paid in the post office in Toronto.

Quorum at Meetings

Art. 11.—Fifteen members in good standing shall constitute a quorum at any meeting of the Club, general, annual or special, and the presiding officer shall have a casting vote. Nine members shall form a quorum of the Executive Committee.

Limitation of Business at General Meetings

Art. 12.—No business other than the hearing of the addresses and notices of motion shall be introduced at any meeting of the Club, unless it has been submitted to the Executive Committee and received its approval.

Calling of Special Meetings

Art. 13.—Meetings of the Executive Committee shall be called by the President, or on a requisition signed by three of its members. Special meetings of the Club may be called by the President, and shall be called by him on a requisition signed by twelve members and stating the object of the meeting. This object shall be stated in the notice calling the special meeting.

Financial Year

Art. 14.—The Financial Year of the Club shall begin on the first day of May in each year and end on the thirtieth day of April in the year following.

Amendments to Constitution

Art. 15.—This Constitution may be amended at the Annual Meeting, or at a special meeting called for that purpose, subject to a two thirds majority vote of the members present.

MEMBERSHIP

as at April 30, 1955.

LIFE MEMBERS

Bruce, Hon. Dr. Herbert
Clouse, F. L.
Cobham, Arthur H.
Coombs, F. J.
Cosens, Gordon G.
Eaton, Donald L. H.
Gibson, D. H., C.B.E.
Gordon, Crawford Jr.
Hough, Thomas Edward
MacKendrick, Col. W. G.
MacNames, Nelson L.
Maher, James P.
Murdoch, J. Y., Q.C., LL.D.
Ridley, John B.
Sandy, J.
Scythes, J. A.
Stapells, R. A.
Suchorab, S. A.
Thomson, K. R.
Tindall, H. B.
Wilson, Col. J. E.

HONORARY MEMBERS

Geary, Major B. Handley, V.C.
Gillespie, Lt.-Col. George H.
Stapells, H. G., Q.C., M.A.

NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS

Ahern, E. G.
Alexander, R. W.
Atton, C. C.
Bailey, B. W.
Ball, B. W.
Barber, John R.
Bateson, Dr. Sydney
Beaumont, Arthur
Begley, Geo. E.
Bennett, J. H.
Bradley, Bruce H.
Bradley, E.
Butler, N. E.
Campbell, C. B.
Coplestone, H. G.
Coppin, T. H.
Cranstoun, John A.
Davey, J. H.
Davidson, George MacK.
Davis, Cyril A.
Deadman, Dr. W. J.
Douglas, D. W.
Drew, Lt.-Col. Geo. A.
Dunlop, J. Gordon
Dutton, B. A.
Fullerton, James John
Gilbert, C. A.
Grant, J. W.
Halbus, Prof. Frank
Ham, C. N.
Hannon, Dr. J. W. G.
Hogan, Walter J.
Howden, Rev. H. R., B.A.
Howsam, Air Vice Marshal, G. R., C.B., M.C.
Hughes, Gordon R.
Hunter, Lt.-Col. F. Fraser
Hutcheson, Frank W.
Hyde, F. C. W.
Jackson, E. H.
Jackson, George B.
Johnston, R. C.
Kennedy, A. P.
Kidd, Hon. T. Ashmore
Kimpton, J. R.
Krause, Edwin H.

Labatt, Lt.-Col. Hugh F.
Leather, Harold H.
Leyden, C.
Line, Reginald H.
Lovell, E. A.
MacKellar, J. F.
MacLennan, H. Alexander
Mambert, Ray R.
Marshall, Dr. M. R.
Massey, Denton
Mathews, C. K.
Maxwell, Rev. Gordon S., B.A.
McCrae, W. H.
McLaren, J. B.
McLaughlin, Col. R. S.
Mitchell, Robert N.
Moffat, John A.
Moller, George
Monsarrat, Nicholas
Morgan, James C.
Mulligan, Rev. William, Orr
Murison, R. A. J.
Newman, J. M., M.P.P.
Nicholson, Desmond
Nixon, Stanley E.
Oakie, Alfred U.
Opie, R. P.
Ostrom, W. R.
Over, Spencer Henry, C.A.
Paynter, W. C.
Perry, John Wm.
Preston, Walter A.
Pugsley, T. Aubrey
Rackley, Frank B.
Raycroft, R. I.
Regan, Major N. H., M.B.E.
Rice, H. E.
Rickwood, George
Rogge, H. H.
Rolland, Lucien G.
Sherk, Frank T.
Smith, Gordon E.
Spence, Dr. W. A.
Spooner, J. W.
Stokes-Rees, Cdr. R. H.
Temple, G. H.
Thompson, E. F.
Thomson, J. R.
Townsend, C. G.
Tupper, Charles
Wallace, H. C.
Wallace, Major N. C., E.D.
Weeks, A. L.
Wideman, Harvey
Willis, Eric B. H.
Wilson, Thomas L.

RESIDENT MEMBERS

Abaroa, Enrique
Abbey, Robert
Abbs, Charles E.
Abernethy, Lt. Col. W. W.
Adair, Herbert E.
Adams, G. W.
Adams, J. C.
Adamson, Edwin F.
Adamson, Walter
Agar, Norman E.
Alban, Arthur
Alberts, Edgar T.
Aletter, Howard G.
Alexander, John B.
Alexander, P. Norman
Alexander, Robert
Allanson, Harry E.
Allingham, N. W.
Althouse, J. G.
Ambridge, D. W.
Ambrose, Philip J.
Ander, J.
Anderson, C. Harry
Anderson, Donald S.
Anderson, J. Murray
Anderson, J. P.
Anderson, Ross
Andrew, Archdeacon G. A.
Andrew, George.
Angus, E. R.
Angus, W. Harry
Annett, D. R.
Appert, R. J.
Appleton, C. N.
Archard, A. S.
Archbold, William D.
Armes, William P.
Armstrong, N. A.

Armstrong, Robert L.
Armstrong, W. E.
Armstrong, W. G.
Ash, W. M. V.
Ashbury, Ivan H.
Ashby, V. W.
Ashley, Sidney E.
Ashton, Arnold
Askin, R. J.
Assheton-Smith, J. E.
Austin, W. H.
Aylward, J. W.

Babbitt, G. W.
Babcock, Harold A.
Baggs, Rev. A. R., D.D.
Bagshaw, B. F.
Bailey, Fred T.
Bailey, John Arnold
Bailey, William Gill
Baillie, Geo. H.
Bainard, R. H.
Baker, Albert G.
Baker, Col. E. A.
Baker, E. G.
Baker, George A.
Baker, G. H.
Baker, George W.
Baker, John R.
Baker, S. R.
Baker, Samuel H.
Balcon, J.
Baldwin, Charles O.
Balfour, Vincent
Bammer, Dr. W.
Band, Charles S.
Band, John T.
Bannock, Russell
Barber, William
Barclay, D. F.
Barclay W. C.
Bark, W. A.
Barnard, E. A.
Barrett, Franklin L.
Bassett, John
Bate, William B.
Bateman, J. R. A.
Bates, Dr. Gordon
Bates, William D.
Batten, G. A.
Batten, Reg. A.
Bawden, H. N.
Baxter, Ian St. C.
Baxter, Major James
Baylay, G. T.
Bays, Eric N.
Beadle, Carson E.
Bealey, Ernest R.
Beatty, D. S.
Bedford, Morley S.
Bedolfe, Robert D.
Beeston, George H.
Begin, Douglas O.
Bell, Lt.-Col. Arthur A.
Bell, Cecil B.
Bell, Eric A.
Bell, Floyd
Bell, J. R.
Bell, Stewart C.
Bellmore, Herbert J.
Belyea, Controller Roy E.
Bennett, A. B.
Bennett, David T.
Bentley, A. F.
Berkinshaw, R. C.
Berlet, Carl S.
Berry, Harry H.
Berry, J. Wilson
Besley, E. H.
Best, Douglas W.
Best, F. M. S.
Best, Gordon H.
Best, T. Harrison
Best, T. W.
Betts, D. Clive
Bick, C. O.
Biggs, G. L.
Bird, S. J.
Birdsall, E.
Birge, Charles A.
Birrell, Dr. Russell G.
Bishop, H. H.
Bishop, Percy W.
Bishop, Samuel S.
Blachford, H. Arnold
Black, David
Blackwell, H. W.
Blackwell, Hon. Leslie E., Q.C.
Blair, J. A.
Blair, S. M.

Blake, Parker G.
Blenkinship, C. S.
Blue, M. F.
Boehm, A. Fred
Boland, John B.
Bolger, H. N.
Bolsby, P. J., Q.C.
Bond, H. B.
Bongard, Gordon R.
Bonnett, Albert A.
Bonus, John L.
Bonyun, Denis F.
Booth, C. W.
Booth, E. H.
Borins, Norman
Bosley, W. H.
Bosnell, G. M.
Bosworth, N. L.
Bottrill, E. A.
Bourne, F. R.
Bourne, J. H.
Bourne, T. W. H.
Boyes, C. M.
Boyko, Joseph, LL.D.
Boylen, Major J. C.
Boyles, Thomas A.
Bradbury, T. J.
Bradley, H. R.
Bradley, M. E.
Bradley, S. J.
Bradshaw, Alec.
Bradt, Leo W.
Brain, George M.
Branson, C.
Bray, A. J.
Breckenridge, R. J.
Breeze, H. R.
Brett, Harold O.
Breuer, K.
Briginshaw, G. F.
Brisbin, Rev. F. G.
Brocker, W. Louis
Brockie, W. G.
Brockington, L. W., C.M.G., Q.C., LL.D.
Brocklebank, Frank
Brockwell, Meredith R.
Bronsdon, H. H.
Brown, Aubrey A.
Brown, Duncan G.
Brown, F. Irving
Brown, Harold A.
Brown, James
Brown, James N. M.
Brown, J. Somerville
Brown, Murray
Brown, Ross S.
Brown, Stuart H., Q.C.
Brown, T. B.
Bruce, A. W.
Bryant, E. W.
Bryce, Robert A.
Bryce, W. Arch
Bryson, R. N.
Buck, Dr. C. A.
Bullock, G. F.
Burden, E. K. G.
Burden, John M., Q.C.
Burgess, Horace T.
Burk, John B.
Burke, E. T. C.
Burn, Kenneth
Burnard, F. S.
Burne, G. F.
Burnett, E. R.
Burnham, Arthur
Burnham, Dr. H. H.
Burns, Chas. F. W.
Burns, H. D.
Burns, Lesslie J. W.
Burnside, E. G.
Burt, Milton G.
Burton, C. L.
Burton, E. G.
Burton, Lt.-Col. G. Allan
Bush, Clayton E.
Bushnell, Wm. J.
Butler, James Roland
Butler, W. Chester
Buyers, Russell W.
Byers, E. S.
Byrne, A. T.
Byrne, J. C.

Cadesky, L.
Cadsby, Jack David
Calder, B. R.
Calladine, Eric A.
Calvert, A. Morrison
Calvert, Gilbert W.

Calvert, H. R.
Calvin, C. C., Q.C.
Cameron, E. Rodney
Cameron, Harry
Campbell, Brig. Colin A.
Campbell, E. M.
Campbell, Hon. Peter
Caplan, Isadore
Cappe, N. R.
Carey, A. R.
Carl, Gordon A.
Carlo, John C.
Carlyle, D. B.
Carnegie, F. T.
Carradus, Capt. H. R.
Carrie, F. S.
Carscallen, H. M., Q.C.
Carson, C. E.
Carson, James L.
Carson, R. B.
Carter, A. S.
Carter, F. H.
Carter, G. S. H.
Carter K. LeM.
Cartwright, T.
Cary, Reginald
Case, Everett J.
Cassels, Gordon T.
Cassels, W. P.
Casule, Kole I.
Caulder, J. A.
Chadburn, T. W.
Chadwick, Major William
Chalmers, Floyd S.
Chambers, Joseph A.
Champion, D. G.
Chandler, David L.
Chapman, S. F.
Chappell, H. L.
Charles, Leo E.
Chenoweth, Dr. T. Oswald
Cherry, Robert
Chester, Lane R. C.A.
Chisholm, John
Chop, Edward M.
Chowen, W. R.
Church, John A.
Clapperton, Gordon, S.
Clark, A. S.
Clark, J. A. P.
Clark, John G.
Clark, Robert F.
Clark, Robert N.
Clarke, John A.
Clarke, Richard L.
Clarkson, John
Clarry, John H. C.
Clemes, J. C.
Cleminson, F. G.
Cleminson, L.
Cochran, H. E.
Cochrane, J. M.
Cockburn, Blake A.
Cockburn, R. N.
Cockell, J. Horace
Coke, Major E. F.
Colberg, A. M.
Colby, S. A.
Cole, Sydney
Cole, T. F. C.
Colebrook, H. G.
Coleman, M. W.
Coles, Gordon E.
Coles, Kenneth E.
Coles, Raymond S.
Colnett, Ronald H.
Comber, W. W., C.A.
Commins, F. C.
Connell, J. H. E.
Connolly, C. P.
Conquergood, C. R.
Coo, H. Douglas
Coo, N. Douglas
Cook, Douglas H.
Cook, F. Gordon, Q.C.
Cook, H.
Cooke, James L.
Cooke, Roy L.
Coombs, Rev. John A.
Coon, B. R.
Cooper, Chas. F. W.
Copeland, W. M.
Copping, Harry, M.I.E.E., P.ENG.
Corbett, H. Milton
Cork, J. Milton
Cornell, Charles R.
Cornish, Controller F. Joseph
Cornish, Prof. G. A.
Corrigan, Lt.-Col. C. A., D.S.O., V.D.

Corrigan, J. H.
Corrigan, John S.
Corson, C. R.
Corson, R. R.
Cosford, E. J.
Cosgrave, Rev. Dr. F. H.
Cottingham, H. R.
Cottrell, W. L.
Coulter, J. E.
Coulter, W. C.
Coulter, W. Howard
Coupland, Walter C.
Courtice, A. Roy
Courtright, J. M.
Coutts, William E.
Cowan, John
Cowan, O. D.
Cowan, P. J.
Coward, Laurence E.
Cox, John R.
Craick, W. A.
Craig, George H.
Craig, Lt.-Col. J. A. D., C.A.
Craig, J. L.
Cranfield, Dr. Harold V.
Crang, J. H.
Cranston, Fred L.
Crashley, Lt. Col. J. D., C.D., A.D.C.
Crawford, E. S.
Crawford, F. J.
Crawford, G. B.
Crawford, J. K.
Crawford, N. R.
Creighton, Arthur H.
Cresswell, H. A.
Creswell, James A.
Crighton, A. S.
Crombie, David B.
Croombs, William J.
Cross, William B.
Crossin, H. W.
Crossingham, J. H.
Crossley, C. J.
Crotty, T. Gordon
Cruickshank, G. C.
Crummey, Dr. Clarence B.
Culnan, Dr. G. F.
Cunningham, Wilbert
Curran, H. E.
Currie, George
Currie, H. D. G.
Curry, Major T. E.
Curtis, Gordon
Cuthbertson, Gordon
Cutler, W. G.

Dadson, A. S.
Dale F. Ralph
Dale, R. G., D.S.O., D.F.C., C.D.
Dales, Robert L.
Daley, Thomas S.
Dalton, C. O.
Dalton, William H.
Daly, R. A.
Damude, E. F.
Darroch, J. J.
Davidson, J. G., M.B.E., M.S.A
Davidson, Jack M.
Davies, David
Davies, Rev. Emlyn
Davies, F. H.
Davies, F. V.
Davies, H. E.
Davies Russell C.
Davis, Bertram N.
Davis, C. B.
Davis, E. R., B.SC., B.ENG.
Davis, George A.
Davis Hilliard L.
Davis, R. Reade
Davis, Walter W.
Davison, Martin A.
Dawson, Isaac
Dawson, J. H.
Dawson, W. M.
Day, Robert E.
Day, W. D.
Deacoff, G. A.
Deacon, H. L. T.
Dean, R. H.
Deans, M. C.
Dearlove, Frank E.
DeGuerre, Fred L.
Denison, J. C.
Dennehy, H. M.
Dennis, J. Wesley
Derry, Duncan R.
Despard, W. H.
DE Veber, L. S.

Devine, Desmond
Devine, Frank
Dewar, A. M.
DeWitt, H. N.
Dibbs, S. Owen, O.B.E.
Dickey, A. J.
Dickinson, Dr. C. H.
Dickinson, Leon R.
Dies, W. C.
Dilworth, H. LeRoy
Dilworth, W. A.
Dingle, Lloyd E.
Diven, Robert E.
Dix, Maurice B.
Dix, William B.
Dixon, A. B.
Dixon, B.
Dixon, Geo. L.
Dodd, George W. W.
Dodd, R. N.
Doherty, Jas. H.
Doke, M. E.
Dolson, Dr. Wilbur J. M.
Donaldson, John
Donovan, Bernard J.
Doody, V. J.
Doran, George H.
Dowsett, Robert C.
Draimin, Charles
Draper, B. M.
Drew-Brook, Maurice D.
Drummond, Harry Gordon
Drury, G. M.
Dubin, C. L., Q.C.
Duckworth, K. J.
Dudley, A. H.
Duff, John M.
Duffett, Norman G.
Dunbar, Arthur
Duncan, James S.
Duncanson, A. A.
Dunkelman, D.
Dunlap, D. M.
Dunlop, W. A.
Dunlop, Hon. W. J.
Dunn, James M.
Dunn, Norman M.
Dunn, William
Dutton, Thomas M.
Dye, Harold E.
Dye, R. A. E.

Eade, Edgar
Eager, King
Eakin, Joseph S.
Easterbrook, James M.
Eastmure, A. W.
Eaton, Col. R. Y.
Eckler, Samuel
Edwards, A. Geoffrey, F.C.A.
Edwards, C. A.
Edwards, H. Percy, F.C.A.
Ekblad, Ronald F.
Elder, C. K.
Elgart, V.
Elgie, G. C., Q.C.
Elliott, B. V., Q.C.
Elliott, Charles R., C.A.
Elliott, E. A.
Elliott, G. N.
Elliott, W. Earle
Ellis, C. Q.
Ellis, J. J.
Ellis, Matthew T.
Ellis, R. M.
Ellison, H. H.
Elton, J. O.
Ely, Edward H.
Ely, R. M.
Emmert, T. J.
Emond, Douglas L.
Empringham, John R.
Engholm, F. G.
Enman, H. L.
Entwistle, John S.
Epstein, H. B.
Epstein, Morris H.
Etherington, F. C.
Evans, S. T.
Ezrin, Maurice
Ezrin, Sydney

Faber, George
Faber, R. W.
Faessler, Charles
Fairclough, R. P.
Falkiner, F. H.
Faludi, E. G.
Farrell, J. J.
Faulkner, J. Farley
Fennell, T. T.
Fenner H. V.
Ferguson, D. W.

Ferguson, H. H.
Ferguson, H. M.
Ferguson, Marshall
Fessenden, C. V.
Field, R. W. A.
Findlay, Major D. M.
Findlay, William
Finley Morley C.
Firstbrook, Hugh M.
Fisher, A. B.
Fisher, A. J.
Fisher, Frank
Fisher, J. W.
Fishman, Philip
Fitzgerald, A. J.
Fitzgibbons, J. J. Jr.
Flavelle, Sir Ellsworth
Fleming, Donald M., M.P.
Fleming, John S.
Fleming, Robert
Flemington, Frank P.
Fletcher, S. S.
Flint, Lyman G. B.
Floyd, C. B.
Fodor, Nicholas
Fogarty, Bruce A.
Foley, Major A. J., M.B.E.
Foord, A. E.
Foord, Lionel H.
Forbes, Lewis J. B.
Forrester, William J.
Forster, F. E.
Forsyth, C. D.
Forsyth, E. G.
Fowler, G. Frank
Fox, John H.
Frankel, Egmont L.
Frankel, Roy H.
Frankling, T. H.
Fraser, Edison
Frastacky, R.
Frazer, A. W.
Freyseng, Willis P.
Friesen, Edward J.
Frisby, Frank W.
Froom, O. W.
Frost, C. Sydney
Frost, C. Sydney, Jr.
Frost, Harold R., Q.C.
Frost, William J.
Fry, H.
Fulcher, Victor H.
Fullerton, John
Funston, R. O.
Fyvie, J. M.

Gairdner, J. A.
Galbraith, C. W.
Galbraith, G. B.
Galloway, Charles T. P.
Gammell, H. G.
Gardiner, F. G., Q.C.
Gardiner, George C.
Gardiner, Percy R.
Gardner, R. J. Currie
Garrett, Albert H.
Garside, S. T.
Gaskell, Ian M.
Gassard, H. L.
Gates, George H.
Gaunt, J. William
Geale, Beverley B.
Geddes, Wm. G.
Geggie, Thomas P., C.A.
Gelber, Marvin B.
Gemmell, John S.
Genovese, Frank A.
German, V. C.
Gerow, Frank T.
Gerstein, Bertrand
Gianelli, Brig. Norman A.
Gibb, W. Kenneth
Gibbens, W. M.
Gibson, J. Douglas
Gibson, Robert C.
Gilbride, W. P.
Gilchrist, Dr. A. J.
Gilchrist, Prof. Lachlan
Gilchrist, L. A.
Giles, T. S. H.
Gill, Capt. Cecil
Gillespie, A. Grant
Gillespie, Ross R.
Gillespie, T. B.
Gillespie, William
Gillett, L. G.
Gillies, J. J. A.
Gilmore, J. D.
Gilmour, A. Harrison
Glennie, George H., C.A.

Goddard, James
Godfrey, Frank
Godfrey, Sam
Godsoe, J. Gerald, C.B.E.
Gohn, Byron E.
Goldring, Dr. C. C.
Goldring, C. Warren
Goldsmith, Martin
Gooderham, F. L.
Gooderham, Lt.-Col. Melville S.
Goodfellow, Bruce
Gooding, M. E.
Goodman, Edwin A.
Goodman, Fred C., C.A., M.C.
Goodwin, Harley D.
Gordon, E. W.
Gordon, K. E.
Gordon, William E.
Gorham, John
Gorrie, T. G.
Gowdy, Douglas M.
Graham, D. M.
Graham, Dr. Howard
Graham, J. Lindsay
Graham, J. Rennie
Graham, Kingsley, Q.C.
Grainger, R. N.
Grant, G. E.
Grant, James A.
Grant, J. R.
Grant, W. G. F.
Gray, Alexander
Gray, E. N.
Gray, K. J.
Gray, William A.
Gray, W. B.
Graydon, J. B.
Grayson, O.
Green, J. D.
Green, Joseph L.
Green, Robert M.
Greenhough, Thomas C.
Gregg, L. T.
Greig, Rev. G. R.
Griffin, H. A.
Griffin, John W.
Griffith, V. T.
Griffiths, F. D.
Grimbly, Maurice
Grose, George W.

Guest, A. E.
Gundy, C. L.
Gunn, Andrew D.
Gunn, Major General John A.
Gunn, Robert F.
Gunyon, C. Cecil
Guyot, Major Roger

Hadden, Eugene R.
Hagon, W. A.
Hahn, George
Hall, Howard A.
Hall, Lt.-Col. I. C.
Hall, J. F.
Hall, W. George
Hall, William
Hallarn, W. J.
Halls, Peter E.
Halter, Dr. H. C.
Hambly, Herbert
Hamilton, A. E.
Hamilton, Alex S.
Hamilton, C. S.
Hamm, R. M.
Hammell, J. E.
Hammond, S.
Hancocks, Oliver
Hanmer, J. D.
Hanna, Wm. B.
Hanson, E.
Harbinson, V. D., F.C.A.
Harcourt, Major R. M.
Harding, Thomas
Hardman, L.
Hardy, H .R.
Hardy, Patrick Arthur
Hargraft, W. M.
Hargraft, W. S.
Harper, R. J.
Harpham, Horace
Harris, Ralph W.
Harris, W. C.
Harrison, James F.
Harrison, Kenneth J.
Harrison, R. A.
Harrison, W. E.
Harton, E. Douglas
Harvey, R. C.
Harvey, Warren G.
Harvey, Dr. W. J.

Harvey, William S.
Hastings, C. E.
Hastings, Warren B.
Hatch, Carr
Hawkins, V. S. G.
Hay, Frank
Hayden, Gordon K.
Hayden, Hon. Salter A., Q.C.
Hayes, Barry B.
Hayes, John D.
Hayman, J. L.
Hayman, J. M.
Hayter, E. W.
Hayward, A. P.
Heagerty, Leo J.
Heal, W. E.
Hearn, Dr. Richard
Hellyer, Paul
Henderson, D. C.
Henderson, Herbert A.
Henderson, J. C.
Henderson, W. G.
Henry, Charles J., M.P.
Henry, E. F. L.
Henry, Hon. G. S.
Henson, R.C.C.
Hermant, Percy
Hermant, Sydney
Heron, Matthew W.
Hetherington, John
Hetherington, A. Stuart
Hewett, F.V.C.
Hewson, E. G.
Heywood, P. K.
Hibbs, N. L.
Hickey, Ross
Hicks-Lyne, R. T. E.
Highmoor, C. K.
Hilborn, Melvin, C.A.
Hill, F. W. J.
Hill, John D.
Hill, J. V.
Hill, Rev. R.
Hill, Roy C.
Hill, Wm. A.
Hill, Wm. S.
Hillier, Ralph C.
Hillmer, R. W.
Hipp, C. E.
Hirst, Josh
Hobberlin, Paul
Hobbs, Jack
Hobson, A.
Hobson, W. J
Hodgins, Albert
Hodgson, Alfred J.
Hoffman, Howard B.
Hogg, Lt.-Col. N. D., M.B.E.
Holden, Dr. Otto
Holford, Wm. D.
Holmes, Hartley R.
Holmes, Noel
Holmes, T.
Homenock, Alexis
Hooker, Edwin R. K.
Hookway, C. W.
Hooper, James V.
Hopkins, Howard
Hopkins, Percy E.
Hotrum, Frederick
Houghton, E. O.
Houghton, W. R.
Houston, H. T.
Howard, A. L.
Howard, Benson C.
Howard, Clifford H.
Howard, Douglas
Howard, R. P.
Howarth, P. H.
Howe, H. J.
Howey, Major Charles B.
Howland, Wm. G. C.
Howse, Rev. E., S.T.M., PH.D., D.D.
Howse, Thomas H.
Huffman, George E.
Huggett, Jack
Hughes, F. N.
Hughes, H. E.
Hughes, J. Edward
Hughes, John A.
Hugill, Albert E.
Hugill, W. M.
Hull, Rodney
Hultay, William
Hulton, William S., C.A.
Hummel, William M.
Humphrey, John B.
Humphreys, W. Eason
Humphries, W. R. B.

Hunnisett, E. A.
Hunt, A. T.
Hunt, John F.
Hunt, R. F.
Hunt, W. E. Harvey
Hunter, B. B.
Hunter B. Pepall
Hunter, E. Norval
Hunter, H. T.
Hunter, Howard W.
Hunter, K. M., C.A.
Hunter, Rev. L. I.
Hunter, W. D.
Huston, J. A.
Hutchinson, J. D. H.
Hutchison, O. A.
Hyland, Nelson A.
Hynes, G. E.

Iliffe-Dean, Charles, B.A.
Inglis, M. Osborne
Ingram, Robert G.
Innes, J. S.
Inwood, Arthur E. M.
Irving, J. D.
Irving, Thomas G.
Ivany, Rev. G.

Jackman, H. R., Q.C.
Jackson, George R.
Jackson, Gilbert E.
Jackson, James A.
Jackson, L. G.
Jacob, E. R.
Jacques, Rev. Canon E.
Jaffray, P.
James, T. B.
Jamieson, H. T., F.C.A.
Jamieson, J. K.
Jamieson, John D.
Jarvis, Albert
Jarvis, Norman S.
Jeffery, W. H.
Jeffrey, J. W.
Jelly, C. S.
Jenney, H. B.
Jennings, M. R.
Jennings, W. A.
Jennison, George Leslie
Jephcott, Dr. C. M.
Jephcott, Gerald, F.C.A.
Johns, Earl
Johnson, Main
Johnson, Orm S.
Johnston, Lt.-Col. Baptist, O.B.E., V.D.
Johnston, D. H.
Johnston, Erskine B.
Johnston, G. F.
Johnston, L. E.
Johnston, Lorne
Johnston, O. D.
Johnston, R. K.
Jolliffe, Lt.-Col. W. H.
Jolly, H. M.
Jones, Charles L.
Jones, D. C.
Jones, Douglas Wm.
Jones, E. L.
Jones, Frank
Jones, Oakah L.
Jones, Robert G. H.
Jones, Capt. Stephen G.
Jones, Terence L.
Jowett, T. Robert
Joyce, James H.
Joyce, Wallace R.
Judd, John Patrick
Jupp, Donald H., O.B.E.

Kasman, Philip
Kay, W. R.
Keats, Lou
Keefler, Lt.-Col. J. K.
Keeler, L. A.
Keenan, J. S.
Keenleyside, H. B.
Kelley, William A. G.
Kellow, Ralph S.
Kelly, J. N.
Kelly, M. J.
Kelly, W. D.
Kelly, Rev. W. Morrison
Kelson, Harry L.
Kemp, T. Y.
Kennedy, Donald G.
Kennedy, John
Kennedy, John H.
Kenney, Telford Vanburgh

Kenny, M. K.
Kent, George E.
Kent, James Palmer, Q.C.
Kernaghan, E. B.
Kerr, Rev. D. M.
Kerr, John E., Q.C.
Kerr, J. W.
Kerr, L. W.
Kerr, P. Gordon J.
Kerr, Robert R.
Kerr, William
Kerr, W. R.
Kert, Lawrence
Keys, Rev. F. B.
Keys, Norman A., Q.C.
Kidd, David
Kilby, J.
Kimber, J. R.
Kindersley, C. M.
King, M. V.
King, R. H.
King, T. A.
Kinghorn, A. A.
Kingsbury, E. D.
Kingsmill, J. A.
Kinnear, T. Clark, F.C.A.
Kirkpatrick, Col. A. E.
Kitchen, C. E.
Kitchen, Dr. Irving D.
Klein, Dr. R. H.
Knechtel, R. W.
Knote, George H.
Knox, D. G.
Koehn, William F.
Koerner, Michael M.
Koropp, John
Krook, Alfred T.

LaBine, Gilbert
LaBine, Joseph S.
La Ferle, Charles
Laidley, K. R.
Laing, G. Blair
Lambert, A. T.
Laming, Hugh S.
Lamont, W. C.
Lamport, Allan A.
Land, Gordon W.
Lane, F. E.
Lang, James
Langley, Arthur James
Larry, Leo J.
Lascelles, G. A.
Laski, Dr. Bernard, M.D., F.R.C.P.
Latimer, H. B.
Laughlen, G. A.
Laurence, E. H.
Lavine, Arthur
Lawrie, Donald L.
Lawson, Frank G.
Lawson, H. R.
Laxton, Edward
Lay, Harry M.
Leacock, George D.
Leake, Ray
Leckey, R. G.
Leckey, Robert H.
Legge, B. J.
Legge, W. R.
Legrow, Rev. A. C.
Legrow, E. L.
Leibel, Dr. Bernard
Leibel, William
Leitch, J. D.
Leith, M. A.
LeMay, R. T. M., C.A.
Lemon, Gordon L.
Lemon, H. G.
Lennie, E. D.
Leslie, Frank
Levenston, Lt.-Col. G. F.
Levy, Mark
Levy, Mort. L.
Lewis, Dr. A. C.
Lewis, L. L.
Lightbourn, A. H.
Lillyman, Reginald
Lindsay, G. C.
Lindsay, W. W.
Lindsley, T.
Linton, Hall
Lister, M. Parker
Lithgow, J. H.
Little, F. M.
Little, Reginald H.
Little, William
Livingston, J. A.
Livingston, Wm. R.
Lloyd, E. M.
Lloyd, T. E.

Lock, Rowland H.
Lockton, O. W.
Lockyer, E. R.
Lofquist, J. C.
Loftus, R.
Long, A. J. M.
Long, Norman W.
Lount, H. M.
Loureiro, V. H.
Lovering, His Honor Judge Egerton
Luby, Cyril J.
Lucas, F. O.
Lucas, Gordon T.
Lucas, Roy O.
Lumbers, G. C.
Lundberg, Hans
Luxenberg, Benjamin, Q.C.
Lynch, Major Charles G.
Lyons, Jarvis
Lyons, John W.
Lyons, Lt.-Col. S. E.

Mabley, C. B.
MacAdam, Wm.
MacDiarmid, Kenneth Hugh
Macdiarmid, W. J. G.
MacDonald, Arthur A.
MacDonald, Rev. A. J.
Macdonald, Charlton E.
MacDonald, Howard
MacDonald, J. B.
MacDonald, J. K.
MacDonald, N. B.
Macdonell, Rex B. G.
MacEachern, Gordon A.
MacFadyen, W. T. A.
MacFarlane, W. S.
Macintosh, J.M., Q.C.
MacKay, Justice F. G.
Mackay, Hon. Mr. Justice J. Keiller
MacKelcan, Fred R.
MacKenzie, B. R. P.
MacKenzie, Wallace J.
MacKersy, L. S.
Mackey, Wallace A.
Mackie, Ernest B.
Mackie, R. A.
MacKinnon, Angus P.
Maclachlan, Wills
MacLaren, Ian
MacLeod, N.
MacMillan, Dr. R. J.
MacMillan, William
Macphee, Norman
Macpherson, Alex F.
MacRae, John
Mactaggart, Rev. Dr. W. A.
Maedel, Clare W.
Magi, M. I.
Magwood, W. Marsh, Q.C.
Maize, John W.
Malcolm, C. J.
Male, W. Harold
Mancantelli, Robert J.
Manning, G. L.
Manning, J. R.
Manning, W. G.
Manton, Frank
Marchant, C. R.
Marchment, W. R.
Mark, Bernard B.
Mark, Howard S.
Markon, K.
Marshall, C. C.
Marshall, Ernest A.
Marshall, E. H.
Marshall, George A.
Marshall, G. Murray
Marshall, Col. K. R.
Marston, A. H.
Martin J. C.
Martin, Walter M., Q.C.
Martyn, H. L.
Mason, V. A.
Mason, V. K.
Massie, Major J. H. C.
Massie, R. H. L.
Matson, Harry
Matthews, A. Bruce
Matthews, C. Syd.
Matthews, Brig. F. Beverley, C.B.E., Q.C.
Matthews, James G.
Matthews, Peter Alec
Maudsley, J. H.
Mawson, H.
Maxwell, Frank D.
May, George E. I.
Maybee, W. E.
Maynard, J. C.

Maynard, Robert B.
Mayzel, Harry
Mazzoleni, Dr. E.
McAdam, Walter George
McAfee, Raymond E., C.A.
McAlister, E. A.
McArthur, Melville H.
McAteer, W. B.
McAvoy, Louis Peter
McBain, Alex Mc.D.
McBrien, W. W.
McCaffrey, E. R.
McCarthy, D'Alton
McCarthy, John
McCarthy, Leigh M.
McCartney, W. S.
McCaul, L. F.
McCausland, Gordon A.
McCausland, J. K.
McClatchie, John, C.A.
McClellan, L. A.
McClelland, D. McK., F.C.A.
McColl, Hugh
McConnell, J. E. Jr.
McCordic, William J.
McCraw, D. F.
McCrea, George L.
McCulley, Joseph
McCullough, J. L.
McCutcheon, M. W.
McCutcheon, W. L.
McDonald, D. F.
McDormand, Rev. Dr. T. B.
McDougald, J. A.
McDougall, R. G. M.
McDowell, George
McDowell, J. N.
McEachern, C. D.
McEwen, Gordon C.
McGaw, A. F.
McGibbon, L. M.
McGill, Cecil D. O.
McGillion, F. B.
McGillivray, Dr. Donald
McGillivray, Major George A.
McGillivray, T. A.
McGowan, L. J.
McGuigan, Dr. J. P.
McHardy, R. A.
McIntosh, Donald A.
McIver, Murdoch
McKay, W.
McKay, Will G.
McKay-Clements, J. L.
McKee, John A.
McKee, John W.
McKinnon, N. J.
McLaren, D. H.
McLaughlin, Paul
McLean, Donald E.
McLeod, Allan J.
McLeod, W. N.
McMillan, N. L.
McMillen, John B.
McNab, Lewis G.
McNamara, John P.
McNeil, W. G.
McNeill, E. W.
McNeillie, William R.
McNicol, J. A.
McPherson, R. S., F.C.A.
McRae, Dr. Colin A.
McRae, Ian F.
McTague, Hon. C. P., Q.C., LL.D.
McTavish, C. E.
McVey, Roy A.
Medhurst, C. E. H.
Medland, J. A.
Medland, John W.
Medland, Michael R.
Medland, T. J.
Meech, R. G., Q.C.
Meggeson, J. R.
Mellish, A. E.
Menzel, D. G. C.
Menzies, Harold
Mercer, D. A.
Meredith, Arthur
Meredith, Desmond
Meredith, J. W.
Merson, Bert
Mess, Brigadier James
Messer, Harry W.
Messinger, Lucien Eli
Metcalfe, Graham
Metzler, Jas. B.
Michell, C. A.
Michener, D. R., Q.C.
Mickler, A. L.
Middleton, John G., Q.C.
Middleton, V. A.

Might, P. G.
Miles, Arthur W.
Miles, Ernest
Miller, Andrew
Miller, J. A. F.
Miller, P. C.
Miller, Robert G.
Miller, T. D.
Milling, C. D.
Mills, George Eaton
Mills, H. C.
Milne, John M.
Milnes, D. H.
Minden, Harold
Minkler, Dr. F. W.
Mitchell, A. N.
Mitchell, A. R.
Mitchell, B. L.
Mitchell, Dr. E. W.
Mitchell, Harold J.
Mitchell, J. C.
Mitchell, R. M.
Mitchell, William G.
Mitchell, Lt.-Col. W. G.
Moffat, D. R.
Moffat, Norman D.
Moffatt, Dr. William
Moles, E. M.
Moncur, W. L.
Monks, R. C.
Montague, Lt.-Col. W. H., O.B.E.
Montgomery, Albert H.
Montgomery, John E.
Montgomery, Dr. Robert C.
Montgomery, Scott
Moon, A. M.
Mooney, K. D.
Moor, C. Rudolph
Moore, Eric R.
Moore, Dr. Herbert
Morden, W. D. S.
Morgan, J.
Morgan, Major J. R. H.
Morgan, Marcel T.
Morgan, William S.
Morison, D. W.
Morley, Frank
Morley, Gerald W.
Morley, Dr. T. P.
Morris, Alex. C.
Morrison, D. M.
Morrison, D. W.
Morrison, Lt.-Col. L. S.
Morrison, Russell W.
Morrow, G. A.
Mortimer, J. A.
Morton, M. D.
Moseley, J. H.
Mothersill, W. R.
Moxon, J. N.
Moyse John S.
Mudie, Hubert C. P.
Mugford, Sidney H.
Muir, Lt.-Col. Chas. A.
Muirhead, C. T.
Muirhead, James
Muirhead, W. T.
Mulholland, R. D.
Muller, R. A.
Muller, Ralph P.
Mulliette, M. R. P., M.SC.
Munn, Charles H.
Murphy, A. P.
Murphy, Thomas A.
Murphy, Thomas H.
Murray, D. Bruce
Murray, Frank C.
Murray, Major Gladstone
Murray, J. Grant
Murray, Parkyn Ian
Mustard, Peter
Mutch, C. M.
Myers, Rev. A. J. W., B.D., PH.D.
Mylrea, A. J.

Napier, David
Nash, Gerald
Nash, Norman R.
Naylor, L. F.
Neary, Bernard F.
Neelands, Donald G.
Neelands, E. V.
Neilly, Balmer
Nelson, E. F. K.
Nesbitt, Russell, Q.C.
Nevitt, I. H.
Newell, John O.
Newinger, K. H.
Newman, Harry A.
Newman, T. C.
Newport, W. R.

Nichol, George H.
Nicholls, H. C.
Nicholls, S. G.
Nicholson, H. A.
Nicholson, K. E.
Nickle, Hon. W. M., Q.C., M.C., M.B.E., M.P.P.
Nicks, F. W.
Nicol, Alexander R.
Nicol, John P.
Nightingale, George F.
Ninnis, W. C.
Noltie, I. N. R.
Norman, Harold F.
Norrington, H. W.
Northey, J. A.
Northway, A. G.
Northway, John H.
Notzl, Paul
Nourse, E. N.
Noyes, W. S.
Nunn, Herbert G., C.A.

Oakley, Thomas
Oborne, J. Ross
O'Brian, R. B.
O'Connor, W. M.
Oldham, Harry
Oldham, Victor
Olver, A. S.
Olver, Lt.-Col. E. A., D.S.O., V.D.
Olver, Major G. C.
Omand, J. N.
Omejer, Major Odegard
O'Neil, Rev. A. H., M.A., D.D.
Onions, Robert
Orliffe, Herbert
Ormiston, Arthur L.
Orr, W. A.
Osborne, Col. J. Ewart
Osborne, Victor A.
Osbourn, A. J.
Oulster, W. J.
Ovens, Col. F. N.
Ovens, G., D.F.C., C.P.A.

Paddle, Leslie Harold
Page, William A.
Palm, William H.
Palmer, Frank W.
Panton, R. L.
Parish, Dr. James A.
Parke, G. M.
Parker, John F.
Parkinson, R. M.
Parks, Capt. Arthur H.
Parry, W. W., Q.C.
Parson, Rev. G. P., B.A.
Parsons, Norman
Parsons, Robert C.
Parsons, Robert S., Jr.
Parsons, T. J.
Partington, Eric
Patchet, E. L.
Paterson, A. S.
Paterson, E., C.A.
Paterson, James G.
Paterson, J. McPherson
Paterson, R. D.
Paton, S. T.
Patten, Edward
Patterson, David S. L.
Patterson, R. E.
Patterson, Major W. E.
Pattison, Dr. C. L.
Paul, George
Peacock, H. Charles
Pearce, N. C.
Pearce, Richard C.
Pearce, R. John
Pearsall, C. F.
Pearson, P. C.
Peckover, George H.
Peever, K. Davis
Pelton, G. M.
Pelton, R. R.
Penaligon, J. H. C.
Penfound, J. E.
Pennington, Roy O.
Penny, John A. S.
Pepper, P. B. C.
Percy, J. L.
Perry, A. E.
Perry, Gordon F.
Perry, N. R.
Peters, A.
Petrie, John S.
Pettit, Holland Jr.
Phelan, R. G.
Philip, William
Phillips, Edwin C.

Phillips, J. C.
Phillips, Leslie
Phillips, Nathan, Q.C.
Phimister, Z. S.
Phipps, G. W.
Pickering, E. A.
Pickup, J. D.
Pierce, Dr. Lorne
Pike, Harry A.
Pilis, C. F.
Pilkington, T. E.
Pineo, Lloyd G.
Pitt, Arnold
Plantner, J. F.
Playfair, S. B.
Playter, W. P.
Porter, Dr. Arthur
Porter, Hon. D. H.
Porter, Dr. George D.
Potter, Raymond E. S.
Poulson, Andrew
Pounsett, F. H. R.
Powley, H. L.
Powley, J.
Pratt, Prof. E. J.
Pratt, J. P., Q.C.
Prendergast, James B.
Prentice, Magistrate John L., Q.C.
Prentice, Victor F.
Prentis, E. D.
Pribble, Ralph E.
Price, Lieut.-Col. W. H.
Priddle, Roger
Prince, A. G.
Prince, H. R.
Pringle, R. J. C.
Proctor, J. E.
Proctor, John S.
Proverbs, C. I.
Publow, C. F.
Puddy, E. A.
Pullan, Harry
Pullen, Major Frank W.
Purcell, Gillis
Purdy, Dr. Vernon W.

Radcliffe, N. D.
Rae, Robert
Raitblat, David
Ralph, George W.
Ralph, R. Ford
Ramsay, Victor R.
Rankin, David
Rankin, Donald O., B.A.
Rankin, Lt.-Col. G. A., D.S.O., E.D.
Ransom, A. C.
Rapmund, J. L.
Rattray, J. S.
Ravelle, R. J.
Ravesloot, L. G. N.
Rawsthorn, Albert P.
Rea, Charles E.
Reddrop, F. O.
Reeb, H. E.
Reeder, Harry
Rees, S. L.
Reeve, Peter E.
Regan, F. E.
Reid, Fraser D.
Reid, Dr. H. W.
Reid, Morgan
Reid, Peter
Reid, V. P.
Reilly, Leonard M.
Rennie, G. H.
Rest, Wm. B.
Reynolds, B. J.
Reynolds, W. B. G.
Rhind, J. A.
Rhodes, Dr. A. J.
Richardson, D'Arcy G.
Richmond, Frank
Rickey, H. R.
Riddell, Frank A.
Riddell, Dr. Walter A.
Ridout, Ernest
Ridout, G. H.
Riley, F. T.
Riley, Very Rev. Dean
Riley, Herbert
Ritchie, Donald H.
Ritchie, Gen. Sir Neil
Ritchie, Robert T.
Roberts, Major A. Kelso
Roberts, C. Percy, F.C.A.
Roberts, D. L.
Roberts, J. H.
Roberts, L. V.
Roberts, R. G.
Robertson, C. S.

Robertson, Douglas S.
Robertson, John F.
Robertson, R. A.
Robinette, T. L.
Robinson, G. H.
Robinson, J. B.
Robinson, John Henry
Robinson, T. W.
Robinson, W. G. W.
Robinson, W. W.
Roche, David J.
Rodomar, O. W., O.B.E.
Roelofson, E. C.
Roger, O. B.
Rogers, George F.
Rogers, H. A.
Rogers, L. R.
Rogers, Norman
Rollason, W. E.
Rolph, F. Grenville
Romani, H. S.
Rooke, L. L.
Rooney, Anthony C.
Rooney, J. H.
Roost, G. H.
Rose, G. H.
Rose, J. W. Jr.
Ross, D. A.
Ross, Ian
Ross, J. Allan
Rotenberg, Harry I.
Rounthwaite, C. F. T.
Routley, Clare B.
Rowe, D. E.
Rowland, G. A.
Rowntree, H. Leslie
Roxborough, E. L.
Roxborough, E. M.
Rubery, A. E.
Ruby, Walling
Ruse, Edward
Russell, S. H.
Rutherford, J. G.
Rutherford, Brig. W. S.
Ruttan, Col. C. M.
Ryan, James J.

Sadowski, B.
St. Lawrence, F.
Sale, R. M.
Salmon, C. R. B.
Salter, W. R.
Samson, Gerald
Samuel, Sigmund, LL.D.
Sanders, C. J.
Sanderson, C. R.
Sanderson, Horrell
Sandwell, B. D.
Sargeant, E. S.
Sarjeant, Dr. P. A.
Saunders, Edward
Saunders, F. T. W., O.B.E.
Saunders, Leslie H.
Saunders, Sydney B.
Saunders, W. V.
Savage, A. D.
Savage, Mark J.
Sawers, Ven. Archdeacon, F. J.
Schalk, D. J.
Scherer, Joseph
Schlesinger, Emil E.
Scott, Ernest W.
Scott, Rex C.
Scott, W. P.
Scott, Wilfrid R.
Scruton, J. F.
Sculthorpe, A. G.
Scythes, E. C.
Seagram, J. W.
Seale, Leslie H.
Sears, T. H.
Seccombe, N. M.
Seccombe, W. Wallace
Sedgewick, K. M.
Sedgwick, Joseph, Q.C.
Seitz, E. Burke
Sembinelli, I.
Sewell, Ralph E.
Shakespeare, W. C., C.A.
Sharp, Major J. McA., E.D.
Shave, W. J.
Shaver, Edward B. H.
Shaver, Rev. W. H., B.A.
Shaw, George
Shay, P. G.
Shea, Orville G.
Shemilt, John R.
Shenstone, Dr. Norman
Shepherd, James H.
Shepley, A. J.
Sheppard, G. H.
Sheppard, Norris E.

Sheppard, W. A. E.
Shields, R. B.
Shier, Dr. R. V. B.
Shipp, E. J.
Shore, B. E.
Short, Rev. John
Shortley, J. B.
Shropshire, Robert C.
Siegal, Harold H.
Sifton, Major Clifford
Sifton, Michael C.
Silvera, Sidney A.
Simmons, Herbert J.
Simpson, James I.
Simpson, J. R.
Simpson, Morris I.
Sinclair, Gordon
Sinclair, Noel B.
Singer, J. G.
Skaith, Alan L.
Skey, W/C L. W., M.P.
Slater, Leslie George
Small, R. Hardy
Smeed, J. R.
Smiley, Ross V.
Smillie, Robert
Smith, Arthur
Smith, Clifford F.
Smith, E. V. Campbell
Smith, D. M. A.
Smith, Rev. F. A.
Smith, Harold
Smith, Harry F.
Smith, Harry R.
Smith, H. E.
Smith, L. W.
Smith, Reid J.
Smith Richard Routledge
Smith, Robert
Smith, R. L.
Smith, S. E. V., C.A.
Smith, Sidney R.
Smith, S. Titchener
Smith, Walter F.
Smith, W. C.
Smyth, A. Rolph
Snelgrove, L. S.
Snider, P. R.
Snively, Major A. C.
Soame, G. R.
Sorenson, D. M.
Southam, F. M.
Sparks, Clifford A.
Sparrow, Eugene E.
Speer, Arthur A.
Spence, E. J.
Spence, Dr. Magnus
Spencer, C. W.
Spicer, James H.
Spooner, C. H.
Spragge, Brig. J. G.
Sprague, S. M. G.
Springer, G. M.
Sproule, M. L.
Stamper, John R.
Stanbury, Dr. W. S., M.B.E., M.D.
Stanley, David C. H.
Stanley, J. N.
Stanley, Richard T.
Stapells, R. Bredin
Stapleford, Dr. E. W.
Stark, Alexander
Starkweather, Harvey C.
Steadman, D. O.
Stedelbauer, J. Elliott
Steedman, R. T.
Stephen, Clarkson
Stephen, F. S.
Stephens, James B.
Stephens, J. H.
Sterling, Stanley C.
Stern, Milton L.
Stevens, H. R.
Stevens, James A.
Stevens, Thomas H.
Stevenson, Frank
Stewart, Alan E.
Stewart, D. E.
Stewart, G. L.
Stewart, Peter
Stewart, W. E.
Stewart, Wm. J., C.B.E.
Stigant, R. F.
Stirling, Rev. Paul
Stodart, D. H.
Stoddart, George W.
Stoddart, T. W. H.
Stoddart, W. H.
Stogdill, Dr. C. G.
Stone, Frank Reid
Stone, J. R.

Stothers, Dr. Carman E.
Strachan, George
Strathdee, Gordon
Strathy, J. G. K.
Strong, Gerald
Stuart, J. Cecil
Stupart, A. V.
Sturtridge, W. C.
Styles, Humphrey
Summers, G. F.
Swanson, Rev. Cecil, D.D.
Sweetman, N. Allen
Swinden, F. A.
Swinson, B. H.
Symons, H. L.
Szasz, Ralph

Taylor, A. S.
Taylor, D. R.
Taylor, E. G.
Taylor, E. P.
Taylor, Reginald W.
Taylor, Scott F. D.
Tedman, Philip H.
Therrien, James A.
Thomas, F. E.
Thomas, H. P.
Thomas, R. H.
Thompson, A. E.
Thompson, A. M.
Thompson, A. O.
Thompson, C. H.
Thompson, George W.
Thompson, Gordon V
Thompson, G. Stanley
Thompson, John M.
Thompson, J. W., Q.C.
Thompson, Murray O.
Thomson, B. R.
Thomson, D. F. S.
Thomson, Harold W.
Thomson, James H.
Thomson, Malcolm F.
Thorne, Don
Thornley, B. E.
Tidy, Major Frank O.
Tilley, J. S.
Tilston, Charles E.
Timmins, Harold W.
Tindall, W. A.
Tinling, B. T.
Tinning, Stanley E.
Tolchard, F. D.
Topp, G. E.
Torrance, F. W.
Tory, J. S. D., Q.C.
Tosevic, Dimitri J.
Townley, N. A.
Trafford-Owen, Lt.-Col. A. E.
Trelford, Dr. William G.
Trenouth, B. T.
Troost, W. J.
Trotter, George F.
Trow, Dr. E. J.
Tubby, W. George
Tudhope, H. R.
Turcot, P. A.
Turnbull, John C.
Turnbull, John S.
Turnbull, W. G.
Turner, E. H.
Turner, James, C.A.
Turner, Mark C.
Turner, R.
Turvey, Major A. J., M.C.
Turville, Frank D., Q.C.
Tuz, Paul
Tyrrell, G. C.
Tyrwhitt, P.

Udell, F. E.
Uebelacker, David A.
Upshall, Walter G.
Urquhart, Norman C.

Van Koughnet, Arthur
Van Nest, F. J.
Van Nostrand, C. I.
Vanstone, B. S.
Vass, J. D.
Vaughan, F. L.
Vaughan, J. J.
Venables, K.
Vetter, E. L.
Vingoe, John F.
Virtue, Roy A.

Waddell, J. C.
Waddington, F. G.
Wadsworth, J. P. R.
Wadsworth, K. F.
Wagner, William A.
Wakelin, Jas. W.

Waldie, R. S.
Waldruff, E. H.
Walford, J. A.
Walker, David J., Q.C.
Walker, D. R.
Walker, George
Walker, H. C.
Walker, J. B.
Walker, John A.
Walkey, R. M.
Wall, A. E.
Wallace, C. D.
Wallace, Brig. F. C.
Wallace, R. J.
Wallis, Dr. H. M.
Walmsley, Joseph
Walsh, Fred T.
Walters, Chester
Walters, Fred Y.
Walton, George E.
Wanless, G. G.
Wansbrough, Victor C.
Ward, Arthur C.
Ward, D. H.
Ward, Rev. Canon J. E.
Ward, Peter
Ward, W. G.
Wardle, T. A.
Warham, W. E.
Warmoll, C. R.
Warner, Murray J.
Warren, Donald C.
Warren, Harold D.
Warriner, E. B.
Warwick, George R.
Waters, Col. Mackenzie
Waters, W. Keith
Watkins, David J., M.B.E.
Watkins, William B.
Watley, E. J.
Watson, C. E.
Watson, W. G.
Watson, Colonel W. H.
Watt, Gordon C.
Watts, M. E.
Waugh, W. B.
Way, Harry J.
Weale, W. H.
Wears, George M.
Wedd, S. M.
Wedlake, J. K.
Weinberg, Bernard
Welch, Frank
Welch, Frank E.
Welch, H. J., F.C.A.
Wells, E. F.
Welsh, A. M.
West, R. Bruce
West, Reg. C.
West, Robert A.
Westcott, Clare H.
White, Dr. A. C.
White, Ernest N.
White, John R.
White, J. E.
White, L. G.
White, Norman A.
White, R. B.
White, Roy J.
Whitehouse, F. P.
Whiteley, J.
Whitfield, A. Edgar
Whitley, Thomas F.
Whittaker, Harry
Whittemore, L. H.
Wicklum, L. Earle
Wickware, R. A.
Wilbur, G. P.
Wilby, J. R. W.
Wilder, William P.
Wildman, A. C.
Wilford, Dr. E. C.
Wilkes, Lt.-Col. F. Hilton
Wilkins, Cyril H.
Wilkinson, E. H.
Wilkinson, Rt. Rev. F. H. M.A., B.D.
Williams, A. R.
Williams, Aubrey E.
Williams, A. W.
Williams, B. J.
Williams, Dr. J. J.
Williams, J. K.
Williams, L. K.
Williams, W. E.
Williamson, E. H.
Willinsky, Dr. A. I.
Willmot, Fred G.
Willoughby, J. A.
Willoughby, V. W.
Wilson, A. E.
Wilson, Major C. H.

Wilson, G. D.
Wilson, Harry H.
Wilson, Hugh
Wilson, John A.
Wilson, John D.
Wilson, P. J.
Wilson, W. H. T.
Winship, G. E. W., F.R.S.A.
Winter, D. J.
Winter, L. A. O.B.E.
Winter, L. W.
Wise, Fred
Wiseman, J. P.
Witherspoon, R. B.
Wittstock, F. W.
Wittstock, Roy C.
Wolfraim, J. E.
Wood, G. H.
Wood, R. J.
Wotherspoon, Brig. G. D. De S.
Wright, Harlow H.
Wright, J. R.
Wrightson, Sidney
Wrong, Dr. Norman
Wyatt H. L.
Wynston, Arthur L.

Yarmey, Wm. J., M.D., C.M.
Yates, George T.
Yoshida, Kenzo
Youell, Leonard L.
Young, Cyril T.
Young, Col. E. J.
Young, George E.
Young, John A.
Young, Reginald L.
Young, W. T.

Zavitz, Harold Beverly

THIS BOOK, DESIGNED BY MR. JOHN W. GRIFFIN,
A PAST PRESIDENT, WAS SET IN "TIMES
ROMAN" TYPE WITH THE HEADINGS
IN FACES OF THE BODONI FAMILY
AND PRINTED AND BOUND
BY T. H. BEST PRINTING
CO. LTD. TORONTO